

# The Classical Review

FEBRUARY 1911

## OBITUARY

MR. S. H. BUTCHER.

THE death of Mr. S. H. Butcher is lamented by the public with a sense of personal loss, and has raised among men of letters, and specially in the spheres of classical learning and education, a dismay and consternation, to which something has contributed beyond the admiration due to a singularly brilliant, harmonious, and beneficent career, and to a legacy of writings, not indeed very large, but all of high quality and, in part at any rate, of great and permanent value. We lose a living type and representation, such as is not and cannot be often seen, of that humanity, that sweet and noble facility of social and intellectual intercourse, which the study of letters should produce or promote. We suffer the eclipse of an ideal. And the loss is especially sensible at a time when everywhere, and not least in this country, the due adjustment of relations between the literary basis and the other elements of culture is matter of debate and difficulty, temporary as we may hope and believe, but pressing and perhaps perilous. Many will echo the significant terms of one among the valedictory notices, which, with the 'Praeses Academiae' joins not only the 'lucidissimus expositor litterarum' but also the 'fortissimus defensor.'

Nothing indeed could be less proper to the moment, or, we may add, less congenial to the spirit and teaching of Mr. Butcher, than to exploit him for

NO. CCXV. VOL. XXV.

the purpose of a controversy. Nor is there any need. Whatever our shades of opinion, we shall not deny, no likely or conceivable reader of this Journal will deny, that Greek language and literature, by direct and indirect influence, have been and still are powerful, as factors, in promoting a certain delicacy, propriety, grace, and subtle simplicity in the pre-eminently human faculty of speech, and a large appreciation of the value of this faculty in individual and national life, and a high sense of patriotic obligation to diffuse these advantages as far as possible; or that in all these, the use, the appreciation, and the duty, Henry Butcher was an excellent example; or that from Greek books and thought he drew the main part of his inspiration, and without them would not, and probably could not, have been what he was.

What he was, all that he was, no one, whatever may have been his opportunities of observation, may pretend to put into words. That not even the spoken word, and still less the written, can contain the man, is a lesson, most useful to bookmen, upon which Butcher himself insists. And if a man is not to be circumscribed by his own words, still less can he be defined by another. Each will see what he can.

One trait is certain, and most important, his extraordinary faculty of speech,—not oratory, but speech for daily and general purposes. He spoke

A

English with a delicacy and ease, a pleasantness in the sound, an unforced precision in the choice of expressions, a rapidity of adaptation to turns of thought and conversation, changes in situation, circumstances, temper, and company, and generally with a complete command, to which one could hardly find a parallel. Whether, or in what degree, he was to be called eloquent, I could hardly say; he was far above the average in that way; but the faculty to which I refer has little to do with eloquence as now practised and understood. Nor do I mean exactly what is commonly imported by the term 'a good talker,' though that he was. I mean, in the simplest sense, that he spoke well, so well that it was a delight to hear and to follow him. He had one advantage, which might be commoner than it is,—he appreciated the difficulty of English. He has some remarks, humorously distressful, upon the unmanageable qualities of the language as applied to writing, and the strange insensibility of many Englishmen to disharmonies and improprieties, whether in books or in speech. He makes comparisons in this respect, especially with Greek and the Greeks, which prove, if anyone were likely to doubt it, that his own sharpness and subtlety of sense had been partly acquired by close and sympathetic study of English in its relations to remote and contrasted idioms. How far, or whether at all, he consciously studied vocal practice as such, I do not know. Consciously or not, he did in fact, I am sure, constantly apply pains to the perfection of speech in its simplest use as a daily instrument. This accomplishment, guided by a warm and generous disposition, a genuine interest in all sorts and conditions of men, and a deep desire to promote intercourse of thought as a humane thing and a good in itself, was one principal element, at all events, in that personal charm, to which so many and such striking testimonies have been recently given. The art—for an art it was in the best sense—was aided by a graciousness of countenance and person, for which beauty must be the word, though the thing was not just that, but better. With

other management, in a man less lofty in his conceptions of private and public duty, all this might have been turned to mere purposes of self-gratification or predominance. Butcher, without the least pedantry or pretension, made of it a boon and lesson to circles ever increasing. Nothing, not even his unsparing industry or his courtesy in all relations, was of greater public benefit, or contributed more to make him the leader and centre that he became.

He had an exquisite sense of humour, and a keen observation of personal distinctions in speech and thought. His conversation, though it moved generally and by preference (as would appear if one came to look back on a whole interview) upon large and important themes, was full of entertaining illustrations from real experience. It seemed to me—I see not how else to put it—that whatever were the subject of conversation, interesting and amusing things, relating to that subject, had always occurred, and recently, within the observation of Butcher. His strokes and pictures were without malice; he had a toleration very uncommon in a man of strong and firm opinions, a fighting man; his disapprobations were mostly conveyed with a sort of seemingly simple irony, the full effect of which depended so largely on the voice that the written words must lose most or all. But even his writings, those especially which were composed for oral delivery, have some touches of the kind. These touches may not be much in themselves, not important doubtless to the solid value of the works. But nowhere is more to be found, now, of the quality which enabled Butcher to do what he did. Here is an instance from the finale of the *Harvard Lectures* (p. 264):

A literary aesthete was described by Lucian as 'a strange phantom fed upon dew or ambrosia.' Him too we know. His house is not upon the solid earth. He sings and soars, he loves and laments, he knows not what or why; harmonious and meaningless is his song. The cult of the meaningless is from time to time in the ascendant. Once at an exhibition of pictures I stood in wonder before a certain portrait. I begged a friend who was initiated into the principles of the school to explain it. The reply was: 'Think away the head and the face, and you have a residuum of pure colour.' Whether this doctrine is to be accepted in painting, and

more particularly in portrait-painting, I do not know; but in literature at least it means sure decay.

The tone here is more than commonly sharp, and would have been less so, with gain of power, in talk; but the turns of the last clauses are very characteristic and apt. In the following reference, half grave and half playful, to Plato, there are touches of the same kind, which may be thought even better:

The homoeopathic cure of morbid 'enthusiasm' by means of music was, it may be incidentally observed, known also to Plato. In a passage of the *Laws*, where he is laying down rules for the management of infants, his advice is that infants should be kept in perpetual motion, and live as if they were always tossing at sea. He proceeds to compare the principle on which religious ecstasy is cured by a strain of impassioned music, with the method of nurses, who lull their babies to sleep not by silence but by singing, not by holding them quiet but by rocking them in their arms. Fear, he thinks, is in each case the emotion that has to be subdued—a fear caused by something that has gone wrong within. In each case the method of cure is the same; an external agitation (*κίνησις*) is employed to calm and counteract an internal. But Plato recognised the principle only as it applied to music and to the useful art of nursing. Aristotle, with his generalising faculty and his love of discovering unity in different domains of life, extended the principle to tragedy, and hints at even a wider application of it. . . .

One must not mar this finished bit of writing by any indication of emphasis, and even comment would be dangerous. But for all that, to recite it well is not easy; and few there were who had not something to learn as well as to enjoy in hearing such passages delivered by the author, or better still in hearing him talk, as he would, in a style differing from this by a still more efficient simplicity and a still subtler ease, upon anything, you may say, to which you chose to lead him. Those hundreds in number, or it may be thousands, who knew and loved his voice, have only to recall and mentally to apply it. When that memory fails, something of it, one may hope, may still survive in the text.

It would be most false, of course, to give or leave the impression, that jesting, or light thought of any kind, was the main, or even a very important, element in Butcher's speech or work. A certain

playfulness was seldom banished, never willingly; and, as he was a sure source of enjoyment, so he intensely enjoyed other men and the human world. But in substance he was *σπουδαῖος*, earnest, elevated, a seeker of great things, and a worker in large fields. I do not think, though I may judge wrong, that even in youth his high spirit would have been well described by the word 'gay.' Certainly not so his later moods; and in that part of his thoughts, to which he chose to give the permanence of publication, the main strand of the cord is always serious. His style has two main types, the expository manner which prevails in the treatise on the *Poetics*,<sup>1</sup> and another more original and, in appearance, more spontaneous, which belongs naturally to the two volumes of addresses, the *Harvard Lectures* and *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*. As a contribution to learning, the treatise on Aristotle is of course far the weightier; but the others deserve not less well to be read, and, for myself, reperusal deepens the sense of their value as well as their charm. They have most of the author. A unity, much more than may at first appear, runs through all. For a choice of specimens, we might take two contiguous essays, *The Melancholy of the Greeks* and *The Written and the Spoken Word*.<sup>2</sup> To the second I have already indirectly alluded; it contains the base and starting-point of Butcher's thought and teaching. The first, which is also a beautiful composition, and, especially in regard to Pindar and Herodotus, a penetrating piece of criticism, ends upon this note:

In the modern world the contradiction between boundless aspiration and limited powers is apt to paralyse high effort. In classical Greek antiquity the sense of man's feebleness heightens his energy of will. The impression left on us is altogether unique in character, and, as a result, the pathetic in Greek poetry is often not far removed from the sublime. 'There is nothing, methinks, more piteous than a man, of all things that creep and breathe upon this earth.' These words were uttered by Zeus in the *Iliad*, and the thought is typically Hellenic. But no less Hellenic is the rousing call of Sarpedon to Glaucus: 'Ah, friend, if once escaped from this battle we were for ever to be

<sup>1</sup> *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art.*

<sup>2</sup> *Some Aspects*, etc., p. 131.

ageless and immortal, neither would I fight myself in the foremost ranks, nor would I send thee into the war that giveth men renown, but now, . . . , now let us go forward, whether we shall give glory to other men, or others to us.' The dark destiny of man is here the very motive which prompts to heroism. The thought is the same as that of Pindar: 'Forasmuch as men must die, wherefore should one sit vainly in the dark through a dull and nameless age, and without lot in noble deeds?'

One half of life, says Butcher elsewhere, Greece has made her domain—all, or wellnigh all, that belongs to the present order of things and to the visible world. Hellenism was not his religion, but it was a material portion of it.

British patriotism—if we give to the epithet its largest and most liberal extension—was another part. For the State in its true idea, as it might and should be, he had a deep reverence, often expressed in a favourite quotation from Burke, whom of all English authors he seems to have best known and most loved:

The State is a partnership in all science, in all art, in every virtue, and in all perfection.

As a spiritual organism, the sum, and something more, of social contacts, interchanges, affections between the minds and hearts of the members, he prized the larger unity highly. But he was profoundly sensible of the difficulties which beset the preservation of this character in the huge modern type: how easily the State, regarded as a machine for security, a protective shell, may become a cause or excuse for making life, in the individual, the family, and the city, narrower, feebler, less spiritual and associative. He knew, and strove against, the special danger of the English temper in this respect—our tendency to self-isolation, our little care for a truly humane *ὁμιλία*. At the ceremony of his funeral, as I recalled his words and work in this aspect, I felt a new and peculiar application of the stern warning cited by the Apostle from the Greek poet: 'Be not deceived—

*φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρήσθ' ὁμιλίας κακῆς.*

His life, though he had his full share of tragic sorrows, was in the main happy as well as prosperous; and it had the

unity, the organic development, which in all things he desired and sought.

He was an Irishman by both parents, with a strain of English blood; his character has been justly described as a happy blend of the two sources. His father, Samuel Butcher, late Bishop of Meath, was Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Trinity College, Dublin, when Samuel Henry was born (April 16th, 1850). He was educated chiefly in England—at Marlborough under Dr. Bradley from 1864, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, from 1869 to 1873, in which year he was Senior Classic. In 1874 he was elected a Fellow of Trinity College, where he resided and taught until the vacation of his fellowship, in 1876, by his marriage. Dr. Bradley, his head-master at Marlborough, had in the meantime become Master of University College, Oxford. Appointed to a tutorial fellowship at that College, Butcher removed to Oxford, and worked there, with great success, until 1882, when he obtained the important post of Greek Professor in the University of Edinburgh. This he held for twenty-one years. Mrs. Butcher died in 1902, and in the following year Butcher resigned his professorship and removed to London. Before this he had achieved a very great reputation, not only in the ordinary professional work of a writer and teacher, but also in all kinds of social and public business connected with the higher education. In particular, he had taken a leading part, not only in the government of the University of Edinburgh, but also, as a Commissioner and otherwise, in the reform of the Scottish Universities under the Act of 1889, as he afterwards did in the foundation of the new University of Ireland. He had also gained an immense acquaintance and personal touch with things, classes, and men concerned, directly or indirectly, in the academic system or systems of the country. Such a man, resident in London and nominally without occupation, was of course overwhelmed with calls for work, to which he responded only too zealously, in such enterprises as the Hellenic Society and the British School at Athens, the foundation of the British Academy (of



which he was an original member, and in 1909 became President), the Classical Association, and others too numerous to mention. The Classical Association, a society which has already done much service, and may develop into great importance, has owed so much to Butcher that he may almost be said to have created it. In 1906 his influence was extended, and his labours enormously increased, by his election, upon the death of his intimate friend, Sir R. C. Jebb, as Member of Parliament for the University of Cambridge. A better representative it is scarcely possible to conceive, and in none of his functions will his place be more difficult to fill. In 1908 he was appointed a Trustee of the British Museum. Among many academic testimonies of admiration may be mentioned particularly an honorary degree from the University of Harvard, where in 1904 he delivered the course of lectures afterwards published. But no list of honours would adequately represent the range and significance of his work, inspired as it was by that peculiar personal power which put reality and life into all his connexions of thought, feeling, and social effort. 'In the higher education of the country he had, in fact, attained an almost unique position. During the last twenty years few changes of moment have taken place in any British University in which he was not concerned; and few appointments of importance have been made in which he was not consulted. And the reason of this confidence was his remarkable combination of judgment, sympathy, and sincerity.'<sup>1</sup>

All this meant overwork. He seemed, however, to bear the strain well, nor—so far as I am aware, and I was in close communication with him—was there any pressing cause for alarm before his return, in last October, from his summer holiday, of which the most part had been spent, as usual, at his house near Killarney. But on October 24th, when he visited Cambridge, and stayed with me, for the last time, to perform one of his incessant public engagements, it was plain, though he was all himself, that he was not ready for a new spell of

work. A few days later came the fatal collapse. He died in London on December 29th, 1910.

It hardly belongs to this Review, and certainly not to me, to estimate Butcher's work as a politician, so far as it was not directly connected with education, learning, or literature. He was a Unionist, and active in his party, though, like most reasonable politicians, he might with propriety be called both Liberal and Conservative. Yet he was Conservative in the main, and by temper and conviction an 'aristocrat' in this sense—that, though he keenly desired and eagerly promoted the diffusion of culture, he was more sensible to the danger of lowering the standard, and of neglecting the most capable and 'best' in order to multiply the number of the 'improved.' A Liberal Democrat will allow that this danger exists, and should be signalled and avoided as far as possible.

Even in practical application of the principle, if we soon come to matters of controversy, there is still room for agreement. Let it be assumed, for instance, that the retention or extension of 'Greek' may be purchased at too high a price: it is still desirable to know what the influence of Greek is, what it can do, and what would be lost with it. On these points Butcher is an excellent teacher, the best that I know. For instance, he will dissipate the confusion which, under the name of 'classics,' speaks as if Greek and Latin could do the same or the like educational work. Butcher was an exquisite Latinist, wrote the language admirably, and could have discoursed admirably upon Latin literature. But he was aware, and never forgot, that in the qualities of freshness and spontaneity, in the revelation—only to be made once by the nature of the case—of linguistic and literary art in process of first development and as a new discovery, Latin is as far from Greek as it could be. I am not saying what practical consequence should now be drawn from this. I say nothing of Butcher's deductions. But anyhow, we should know and feel the true facts. And nowhere will the English reader find them better set forth than in the writings of Butcher. Omissions there

<sup>1</sup> *The Times*, December 30th, 1910.

are, of course, and perhaps some qualifications to be made, in the fringes of the subject—for instance, when, by implication, he touches on the quality of the 'modern languages.' He may not have done justice, in particular, to the language and literature of France. But what he says positively, on the main theme, is the essential truth; and, like all his thought, it lives.

In connexion with his politics, since one of the most noted and most remembered of his utterances in Parliament was a strong speech against the political enfranchisement of women, it will be well to note, that he worked zealously for the inclusion of women in higher education, and did services to this cause, at Oxford, at Edinburgh, and elsewhere, which have been conspicuously and gratefully acknowledged.

As a contributor to learning, he will probably be measured mainly and eventually by the book *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. The prose-translation of the *Odyssey*, of which he was joint-author, is indeed more widely known, has great value both from the learned and from the popular point of view, and will not soon, if ever, be superseded. The collected essays and addresses have at present much importance; they may hold a permanent place, or they may not: *habent sua fata libelli*. If anything else of the kind, not published, remains, it is to be hoped that the question of publication will be considered, of course under the strict respect due to the wishes, if ascertainable, of the author. The text of Demosthenes, which he partly completed, is a work of great labour and will be mentioned with gratitude. He knew and loved Demosthenes as few now do; and, could he have spent his time twice, could he have done more than fill it with useful work, he might have added to this text, and to the booklet *Demosthenes* of 1881, expository work on the Greek orators for which no hand so fit is likely to be found. But among what

he has done, the treatise on the *Poetics*, as a contribution to learning, stands pre-eminent. Butcher was here thoroughly in his element. It will be noted, in the book *Some Aspects of Greek Thought*, how naturally the lines of reflexion run up to the final part—a discussion of the Aristotelian *Poetics* which partly anticipates the complete treatise. It was a gain too, or certainly no disadvantage, that opinion on the *Poetics* is, or was, in a state urgently demanding correction. No book, as Butcher humorously remarks about a certain famous sentence in it, has been more cited, discussed, and explained 'by men who knew Greek, and by men who knew no Greek.' He was compelled here to dissent often from respectable and persistent tradition; and it was not on the side of such dissent that he was likely to exceed or to err. His corrections are many, subtle, invaluable, and the book, indispensable to students of the subject, will commend his name to times not in touch with his practical work.

For the present, that practical work, and the man himself, are the gifts that most move our thanks. Few men have better served their generation, and of scholars perhaps not any.

At the end of so fine a piece, when we are dismissed, as from a *Samson Agonistes*, 'with new acquist of true experience,' grief, private grief, must not be importunate. But a word, a word of gratitude, will perhaps be indulged to a friendship of forty-two years. I saw Henry Butcher for the first time at Marlborough, early in the year '69, and shortly before we were together elected to scholarships at Cambridge. I was taken to Marlborough by my father mainly for the purpose of making his acquaintance. From that time till now we have been often together, and always in close mental touch. He has been a chief factor in my life. Among the multitude of mourners not many have more cause.

A. W. VERRALL.

J. E. B. MAYOR.

JANUARY 28TH, 1825—DECEMBER 1ST, 1910.

JOHN EYTON BICKERSTETH MAYOR was the son of the Rev. Robert Mayor and Charlotte Bickersteth, sister of Lord Langdale and of Edward Bickersteth of Watton. A few days after his death four brief and characteristic contributions from his pen appeared in the *Classical Review*, which will always be associated with the fact that it was edited by his younger brother, Joseph Bickersteth Mayor, for the first seven years of its existence.

John Mayor was born on January 28th, 1825, at Baddegama, in Ceylon, where his father was a missionary of the Church Missionary Society. At the age of six he revelled in Rollin and the English Homer and Virgil (both in prose) and in the English Nepos and Caesar. Early in his eighth year he was sent, with his two elder brothers, to the Grammar School of Newcastle-under-Lyme, where he was a day-boy under the headmastership of Mr. Anderson. His elder brother, Robert, afterwards Fellow of St. John's and Mathematical Master at Rugby, was greatly taken with John's vehement spirit, shown even there by his readiness to fight boys even so much bigger than himself, and also with his ready memory and precocious love of learning. Before completing his eighth year, he was sent to Christ's Hospital, and it is surmised that his stoical endurance, his asceticism, and his antiquarian and historical interests were fostered by the strange survival of sixteenth-century life, into which he had been thrust in the very heart of London. In his eleventh year, after an attack of scarlet fever, he was withdrawn from school, and spent two or three years at home, learning Greek, as well as Latin, from his mother. When he was about thirteen he went to Shrewsbury, the school which won his loyal devotion for the rest of his long life.

At St. John's, Cambridge, his private tutor was William Henry Bateson, subsequently Public Orator, and ultimately Master of the College; and in the Classical Tripos of 1848 his name appeared in the third place in the First

Class, immediately below C. B. Scott and Westcott.

From 1849 to 1853 he was a Master at Marlborough, where (apart from his principal work with the lower sixth) it was his duty to teach one of the lowest forms three hours a week. It was at Marlborough that he prepared his erudite edition of *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*, 1853. In 1886, in the 'advertisement' of the fourth edition of Vol. I., he thus records the genesis of the work:

'When, in 1850 or 1851, my friend the publisher said to me, "You ought to bring out a book," it was no special acquaintance with Juvenal that suggested the choice, but dissatisfaction with Rupert's edition, then holding the field. "I have a good many notes on Juvenal, and Rupert's book is not worthy of his author."'

After his return to St. John's as a College Lecturer, he contributed to the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* two comprehensive articles on Latin lexicography, which appeared in November, 1855, and in March, 1857, and were marked by the same love of learning and familiarity with its history, which continued to be his leading characteristic for more than half a century of his subsequent life. He also produced, in 1861, the first of the six editions of Cicero's *Second Philippic*, founded on that of Halm. Meanwhile he had thrown himself with ardour into various forms of literary and antiquarian research. He printed the four earliest codes of the College Statutes, completed and published Baker's History of the College, and edited Roger Ascham's *Scholemaster*, and the biographies of Nicholas Ferrar, Matthew Robinson, and Ambrose Bonwicke. For the 'Rolls Series' he edited in 1863-69 the *Speculum Historiale*, bearing the name of Richard of Cirencester, pointing out the sources of all the borrowed erudition of the forger of that chronicle. In 1868 he produced his excellent *First Greek Reader*, with a racy preface on classical education.

During the three years for which the Professorship of Latin was held by Munro (1869-72), Mayor was accident-

ally engaged in bringing out a second edition of his *Juvenal*. In 1872 he was elected Professor. The favourite subjects of his lectures were Martial, and the letters of Seneca and Pliny, with Minucius Felix and Tertullian. In 1875 he published a bibliography of Latin literature founded on that of Hübner; in 1878 a joint edition of the third and fourth books of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*; in 1880 an edition of the third book of Pliny's Letters; and in 1889 a critical review of the *Latin Heptateuch* of Cyprian, the sixth-century poet of Toulon. The introduction to this last work closes with a few interesting reminiscences of his old head-master, Dr. Kennedy. Three years before, he had dedicated to Dr. Kennedy the first volume of the fourth edition of his *Juvenal*. In the 'advertisement,' under the heading of a series of mottoes from the *Satires*, we have the editor's discursive views on many of the subjects of the day. The last words are:

'Henceforth I hope to devote myself to clearing off my many literary arrears, reserving for my old age a commentary on Seneca, for which I have made large collections.'

The *Commentary on Seneca* never appeared, and of the editions of several books of the *Odyssey* and of the tenth book of Quintilian only a small portion was published.

The finest specimens of his English

style are to be found, not in his introductions or in his lectures, but in the sermons preached in the chapel of his College and elsewhere. Some of these were inspired by the Old Catholics, the Spanish Reformed Church, and the Church of Scotland, and by the simple life exemplified by a moderate variety of vegetarianism.

In his old age he quickly mastered Esperanto. He was familiar with French, and especially familiar with German and with Dutch. He represented his University at the tercentenary of Leyden, where he met Madvig and Cobet. He paid only one visit to Rome, where, apart from memorials of ancient ages, he was mainly interested in the modern schools.

He was one of the original Fellows of the British Academy, and he received honorary degrees from Oxford, Aberdeen, and Glasgow. On his eightieth birthday, a Latin address of congratulation, written by Dr. Reid, was presented to him at a meeting presided over by Sir Richard Jebb. In the preceding year his portrait, etched by Herkomer, had appeared as the frontispiece of *Minerva*. One of that artist's masterpieces is the portrait painted in 1890, and now preserved in the hall of St. John's.

J. E. SANDYS.

Merton House, Cambridge.

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### NOTE ON HOMERIC HYMN TO DEMETER, 239 ff.

I WAS glad to find a suggestion of Dr. Fraser, supporting a view at which I had independently arrived that behind the Demophoön story lies a rite of infant initiation, not one of child sacrifice.<sup>1</sup> Prof. Murray has shown that the hymn has been expurgated and that the expurgators had probably in mind the

atrocities of infant sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> The Greeks were always making analogous mistakes; Pausanias, we remember, explains as a survival of human sacrifice the scourging of the Spartan lads.

To the Demeter story must be added the Thetis legends, of which again two versions have come down to us; in one

<sup>1</sup> On *Some Ceremonies of the Central Australian Tribes*. Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science (Melbourne, 1901), p. 319.

<sup>2</sup> See *Rise of the Greek Epic*, Appendix G, p. 276 f. Prof. Murray no longer believes that 'the whole myth is based on a ritual of child sacrifice.'



(*Ap. Rhod. Arg.* IV. 869 foll. Apollodoros III. 171-172) the child survives, but misses immortality, while in the other, Hesiodic, variant the children's mortality is tested with fatal results by immersion in a cauldron of water or by putting them in the fire (Hesiod frag. 185, *Rzach.* the Laurentian Scholiast *ad Ap. Rhod.* IV. 816 citing Aigimios, *Schol. Laur. Apoll. Rhod.*). Of course there is the familiar story of Achilles' immersion in the Styx, which rendered him invulnerable with the exception of the unwetted ankle.<sup>1</sup>

The significant points in these stories are: (1) A child is immersed in water or placed in fire; (2) the alleged motive is a test of its mortality or the confessing of immortality; (3) the imperfection of the child (*γυνῶναι βουλομένη εἰ θνητοὶ εἶσιν*) or the interruption of the ceremony is fatal.

Now rites which have for their object the strengthening of the infant's weak hold on life are familiar in the Lower Culture; in genus they are the same as the initiation rule of puberty. And we constantly find aitiological myths to account for their observance. In a Nandi story all Kipyenko's brothers and sisters died on reaching puberty, so he invented the rite of circumcision in order to 'change' his children at this dangerous crisis of life.<sup>2</sup> Similar is the story of how Medea 'hid away' her children in the temple of Hera to make them immortal,<sup>3</sup> or the tale of how Demeter nursed and saved Orthopolis, none of whose brothers and sisters had survived their first squall.<sup>4</sup>

There is further evidence that in such ceremonies of making life for infants fire and water have played a part. Of course there is the Amphidromia, where, I believe, that the original purpose was that of bringing the infant into contact with the magical element. In Scotland,

in the seventeenth century after an infant, newly baptised, was carried home from church, the midwife or another waved it through the flame, repeating thrice, 'Let the fire consume thee now, if ever'; and in the nineteenth century a child placed on a basket filled with provisions has been conveyed round the crook of the chimney.<sup>5</sup> In the North of England a match is often given at a christening to light the way to heaven or to light a fire to keep the child warm all his life.<sup>6</sup> In County Leitrim a bit of turf from the fire is sewn on to a child's bib after christening.<sup>7</sup> In Sweden until the infant is named the fire must not be extinguished, no one must pass between it and the infant, and no one entering the house may handle the child without previously having touched the fire.<sup>8</sup>

In all these cases the rite is analogous to a puberty rite, where contact with fire is employed as a means of obtaining the necessary power to live in the new grade in which the candidate is passing. Luiseño girls, for example, are roasted for 3 days.<sup>9</sup> And the same people tell how a boy followed a rabbit down a hole to the Chungichuish people. They had power, and could do anything. They would stand up and leap, jump and dance, moving about, jump into the fire, and stand in the middle of it. All took turns, and then said to the boy, 'It is your turn now.' He was frightened, but sang a song, and then jumped into the fire. He felt no heat, and after awhile came out unharmed. They all shouted and said, 'Now you are a good Chungichuish.'<sup>10</sup> The case of water is even clearer. A bairn, they say, never

<sup>5</sup> Dalzell, *The Darker Superstitions of Scotland*, p. 176.

<sup>6</sup> Miss Brown in *Folklore*, xxi. p. 226; Henderson, *Folklore of the Northern Counties*, p. 20. Cf. the warming-pan at Whitby (*County Folklore*, ii., 'The North Riding,' Mrs. Gutch, p. 284).

<sup>7</sup> Duncan, 'Further Notes from County Leitrim,' *Folklore*, v. pp. 186-187.

<sup>8</sup> Henderson, *op. cit.* pp. 21-22.

<sup>9</sup> Du Bois, *The Religion of the Luiseno Indians* (University of California publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 8, No. 3, p. 94). For the acquisition of 'Zauberkraft' as the motive in puberty tortures, see Preuss in *Globus* 87, p. 415.

<sup>10</sup> Du Bois, *op. cit.* p. 150.

<sup>1</sup> The ankle motive appears also in the fire story, *Ptol. Chenn. Nov. Hist.* vi. p. 152B-195W quoted Pfister, *Der Reliquien Kult*, p. 322.

<sup>2</sup> Hollis, *The Nandi*, p. 99.

<sup>3</sup> *Eumelos* quoted by *Pausanias*, II. 3. 11. Probably the story refers to the definite practice of exposing infants in temples; cf. the case of Kassandra and Helenos. The use of the word *κατακρυπτεν* is perhaps almost technical.

<sup>4</sup> *Schol. Pind. Ol.* xiii. 74.

thieves until it is christened.<sup>1</sup> The Styx in which Thetis immersed her son was the eldest of the rivers.

αἶ κατὰ γαῖαν  
ἄνδρας κουρίζουσι σὺν Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι  
καὶ ποταμοῖς ταύτην δὲ Διοὶ πάρα μοῖραν  
ἔχουσι.<sup>2</sup>

The reason that hair was cut in honour of rivers was the fact that they were *κουροτρόφοι*,<sup>3</sup> and the motive was analogous to that which leads the Malay to bribe some pilgrim to cast the cuttings of his child's hair into the holy well of Zemrem.<sup>4</sup> The Bageshu of Mount Elgon sprinkle the water of sacred waterfalls over the heads of children to give them health and strength.<sup>5</sup> Greek tradition is full of the washing of infant gods and heroes in the rivers of Hellas.<sup>6</sup> It was from the Spring of Oropos that Amphiaraios rose first as a god.<sup>7</sup>

'A virtuous well, about whose flowery banks  
The nimble-footed fairies dance their rounds  
By the pale moonshine dipping oftentimes  
Their stolen children, so to make them free  
From dying flesh and dull mortality.'

Fletcher's fairies are doing just what Demeter and Thetis did.

In the light of Mr. Hartland's study of sacred wells I am disposed to regard the primary object of the rite as that of union with a magical or divine power. A child may be exposed in a temple or nursed by a goddess, or put into fire or water: the fundamental and primary notion is one and the same. But of course this 'union' is not the whole matter; the tangle of human belief is not so simple. And it will be asked why in the older version was Demophoön burned to death, and why is immersion in the cauldron or passing through the fire a test?

First of all, it is possible that the notion of death to new life, *i.e.* the mock

death of initiatory ceremonies, may have played a part. The pretended burning of candidates at initiation and their recreation from the ashes,<sup>8</sup> or the idea of drowning to rebirth,<sup>9</sup> are quite familiar notions all over the world. And these ritual deaths have undoubtedly been the origin of many of the atrocities of myth and story. For example, the 'Lemnian deeds,' or the story of the sons of Aipytos, are probably tales reflecting the ritual of an earlier age.

Secondly, as regards the test of mortality, which is Thetis' plea, such rites are liable to be as a matter of fact dangerous. Take, for instance, the roasting rite which the Malay mother has to undergo.<sup>10</sup> In the British Isles exposure at holy wells was recognised as an heroic remedy. The well of Therdyhill will 'either end or mend' the patients, though more are reported to recover than do not.<sup>11</sup> Spartan women washed their babes with wine, 'making trial of their habit of body, imagining that sickly and epileptic children sink and die under the experiment, while the healthy become more vigorous and hardy,'<sup>12</sup> and Sir Thomas Browne says of the Greek immersion of infants: 'Nativity may outlast a Natural Birth and a knife may sometimes make way for a more lasting Fruit than a Midwife, which makes so few Infants now able to endure the old Test of the River—*natos ad flumina primum deserimus saeвоque gelu duramus et undis.*'<sup>13</sup>

And together with the actual danger of the rite goes the development of the theory of the ordeal. What the Melanesian calls *mana* has power to blast as well as to bless, and to endure with profit contact with great *mana* your own power must be strong enough.<sup>14</sup> The magical water or the god who directs the poison or the rapier finds

<sup>1</sup> See examples, Henderson, *op. cit.* p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Hesiod, *Theog.* 346-348.

<sup>3</sup> Pausanias, viii. 41. 3, i. 37. 3; Homer, *Iliad*, xxiii. 140; Schol. A and B, *Iliad*, xxiii. 142.

<sup>4</sup> Skeat, *Malay Magic*, pp. 342, 355.

<sup>5</sup> Roscoe, *J.A.I.* xxxix. p. 189.

<sup>6</sup> Pausanias, 38. 9; iv. 33. 1, viii. 16. 1, viii. 8. 2; Plutarch, *Lys.* 28; Euripides, *Bacchae*, 521.

<sup>7</sup> Paus. i. 34. 4.

<sup>8</sup> See Miss Harrison on the Kouretes and Zeus Kouros, *B.S.A.* xv. p. 324 foll.

<sup>9</sup> Preuss, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1905, p. 434.

<sup>10</sup> Skeat, *Malay Magic*, pp. 342, 343.

<sup>11</sup> Scott, *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, vol. ii. pp. 318, 319. Cf. another example in Moore, *Folklore*, v. p. 223.

<sup>12</sup> Plutarch, *Vit. Ly.* cxvi., trans. Langhorne.

<sup>13</sup> Sir T. Browne, 'A Letter to a Friend upon occasion of the Death of his Intimate Friend.'

<sup>14</sup> *Folklore*, xxi. p. 147 foll.

out the weak spot. That is the essence of the ordeal and the ultimate reason why the water of the Styx, the eldest of the *κουροτρόφοι*, was held to be a deadly poison. Mothers all over Europe have employed contact with the fire, not indeed to make their children immortal, like Demeter, but to get back their own healthy babies in the place of changelings or Callicantzari.<sup>1</sup>

And there is yet another element which contributes to the theories of such rites as explained by the different stages of civilisation which have employed them. The Amphidromia, we are told, is a ceremony of purification. That is probably just what it meant to a thoughtful Athenian of the fifth century. To us of course the image of the Lord, who is 'like a refiner's fire,' is familiar enough, and the idea was no less familiar to classical antiquity. Apotheosis by fire,

the plea of Demeter's barbarous act, was well known in the ancient world.<sup>2</sup> 'Fire destroys the material part of sacrifices, it purifies all things that are brought near it, releasing them from the bonds of matter and in virtue of the purity of its nature, making them meet for communion with the gods.'<sup>3</sup> And similarly in the apotheosis of Aeneas the river washes away all his mortal past, leaving the divine to seek its home among the gods.

'Hunc iubet Aeneae quaecumque obnoxia morti  
Abluere et tacito deferre sub aequora cursu  
Corniger ex sequitur Veneris mandata suisque  
Quidquid in Aenea fuerat mortale repergit  
Et respergit aquis; pars optima vestit illi.'<sup>4</sup>

W. R. HALLIDAY.

<sup>1</sup> For Callicantzari in Chios see Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, p. 208.

<sup>2</sup> Fraser, *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris*, p. 146 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Iamblichos de Mysteriis*, v. 12, trans. Frazer, *loc. cit.* Cf. use of fire in purification. Melampus purified the Proitids *θαῖσι μῆσσι σκιδλλη τε μῆσσι*. Diphil. ap Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 26. 844.

<sup>4</sup> Ovid, *Met.* xiv. 600.

#### ON THE 'APOTHEOSIS OF CLAUDIUS,' CH. 6, ll. 5-6.

'LUGUDUNI natus est, Marci municipem vides.' In this description of the Emperor Claudius, given by the goddess Febris to Hercules, the reading 'Marci' has caused a sad deal of perplexity, thanks to its apparent lack of point. From Gronovius onward editors have taken refuge in emendation into 'Munati' or 'Planci,' with reference to the constitution of Lugudunum as a colony by L. Munatius Plancus; while recent annotators, who retain 'Marci' in their text, because of the consensus of MS. authority in its favour, find great difficulty in explaining its relevance to the context.

Professor Bücheler's<sup>1</sup> comment is as follows: 'Facete ita vocari sentio civem Romanum ex colonia municipiove quasi non natum civem Romanum sed factum.' Such nicknames were indeed not unknown to Latin usage—witness 'Juni-ani,' 'Orcivi'—where a similar personal allusion served to designate a special political status. But there is no parallel

passage which in any way substantiates the particular idiom 'Marci municipes' as a conventional expression. Mr. A. P. Ball,<sup>2</sup> while rejecting an explanation on the lines of Bücheler's, does not profess to give a satisfactory alternative.

Meanwhile, the personality of 'Marcus' has been identified by de Boissieu.<sup>3</sup> This scholar has given good reason to believe that the constitution of Lugudunum as a colony by Plancus took place at a later date than is usually supposed,<sup>4</sup> and that its original foundation as a municipium in 43 B.C. was achieved under the authority of Mark Antony, who was no doubt, as Mr. Ball suggests, the first 'patronus' of the town.

Once the identity of 'Marcus' with

<sup>2</sup> *The Satire of Seneca*, etc. (Columbia University Press; 1902).

<sup>3</sup> *Inscriptions antiques de Lyon* (Lyon, 1846-54), pp. 125-132.

<sup>4</sup> The colony of Raurica, which was founded by Plancus probably at the same time as Lugudunum (*C.I.L.* vol. x. No. 6087), cannot have existed before 27 B.C., as is clearly shown by its modern name Augst ('colonia Augusta').

<sup>1</sup> *Petronii Satirae* (ed. 1904; Weidmann).

Mark Antony has been established, the significance of the whole passage need no longer elude us. It can be made perfectly clear by a reference to two passages in Plutarch's life of Antony.

Ch. 4 *init.*: (ὁ Ἀντώνιος) ἐδόκει τοῖς γραφομένοις καὶ πλαττομένοις Ἡρακλέους προσώποις ἐμφορὲς ἔχειν τὸ ἀρρενωπόν. ἦν δὲ καὶ λόγος παλαιὸς Ἡρακλείδης εἶναι τοὺς Ἀντωνίους.

*Demetri et Antoni Comparatio*, ch. 3: Ἀντώνιος δέ, ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ὁρῶμεν τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τὴν Ὀμφαλὴν ὑφαιροῦσαν τὸ ῥόπαλον καὶ τὴν λεοντὴν ἀποδύονσαν, οὕτω πολλάκις Κλεοπάτρα παροπλίσασα καὶ καταθέλσασα συνέπειρεν ἀφέντα μεγάλας πράξεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν καὶ στρατείας ἀναγκαίας παίζειν μετ' αὐτῆς.

As the ancestor and prototype of Antony, Hercules with all his slowness of wit ('*homo minime vafer*') may well be supposed to have understood

whom Febris meant to denote by 'your Marcus.' And the piquancy of her allusion becomes evident when it is remembered that the analogy between the careers of Hercules and Antony, as set forth by Plutarch, was not particularly creditable to either: one can imagine Hercules pulling a wry face on Febris reminding him of this association. To anybody who is aware of Antony's connexion with Hercules—and the wits of Rome in the days of Seneca (or Petronius) could hardly fail to notice it in all its bearings—the expression '*Marci municipem*' thus appears full of meaning; indeed, it may be regarded as typical of the malicious yet unobtrusive humour with which the 'Apotheosis' is spiced in great abundance.

M. O. B. CASPARI.

London University.

#### PROPERTIUS, II. xxv. 17.

sed tamen obsistam. Teritur robigine mucro  
ferreus, et parvo saepe liquore silex;

at nullo { dominae NFVD } teritur  
          { de me DV }

{ sub limine NL }  
          { sublimine FDV } amor qui

restat et immerita sustinet aure minas.

I. THERE is a prescriptive argument against both *sub limine* and the hypothetical *sublimine*, which might have saved Propertian editors a deal of trouble; *immerita sustinet aure minas* presupposes a noun expressing something audible, a sound.

2. Rothstein, whose notes are never irrelevant, feels (though he has some difficulty in making the construction tally with his feelings) that the *restat* needs to be as closely as possible linked up in a phrase with *amor qui* in order to ease off the shock of the monosyllabic hexameter ending. The integrity of this strange piece of metre seems to me manifest: a more improbable conjecture than Baehrens' *amator* was never made.

Parallelism suggests that the hexameter prepared for *immerita sustinet aure minas* some phrase for scolding. Neither *convicia* nor *iurgia*, common in such contexts, both of them, will fit this place; but another word will, *lis*.

#### Comparing

haec postquam querula mecum *sub lite* peregit  
(Prop. IV. vii. 95)

and the description of Sisyphus in *Culex* 245, where motives of sense and of palaeography alike commend the reading

acerba  
otia quaerentem frustra *sub lite*,

and rectifying the merely consequential corruption of *nullo* for *nulla*, we shall start with

at nulla dominae teritur *sub lite* . . .

which both the *ductus litterarum* and the shape of the phrase will lead us to complete by the predicate *memor*:

at nulla dominae teritur *sub lite* memor qui  
restat et immerita sustinet aure minas.

('The man who abides constant and with undeserving ear endures menaces, cannot be worn out by any scolding words of his mistress.')

Ter. *Andria*, 281 furnishes a pretty instance of this *memor*:

*Mysis*. Unum hoc scio, hanc meritam esse ut  
*memor* esses sui.

*Pamphilus*. *Memor* essem? O *Mysis*, *Mysis*, etc.



*Nulla* might indeed be left unchanged if we transposed *teritur* and *dominae*: 'Nothing wears out the patient lover who can abide his mistress' scolding,' etc.

ut nullo teritur, dominae sub lite memor qui restat.

### III. xiv. 7.

I doubt if Propertius really wrote such a metrical monstrosity as

pulverulentaque ad extremas stat femina metas,  
though none of the commentators appear to feel any scruple about it.

Suppose the text ran,

laetaque ad extremas stat femina pulvere metas,

and suppose the copyist accidentally skipped the word *pulvere* and added it in the margin, would not

*pulvere laetaque* ad extremas stat femina metas

be almost certain to turn into just what the MSS. now offer?

### III. xxi. 16.

Romanae turres, et vos, valeatis, amici;  
Qualiscumque mihi, tuque puella vale.

The enormous hyperbaton of *que* and the consequent displacements of emphasis recommend two possible emendations of the pentameter. One, which was suggested to me by Mr. A. B. Muir, a student of this University, is to read

qualescumque mihi; tuque puella vale.

But xviii. makes against this

sed qualiscumque es, resonent mihi 'Cynthia' silvae.

The other is the re-arrangement

tuque mihi qualis cumque puella vale,

which gives a caesura by tmesis, such as a copyist might not have allowed for a caesura at all, and which at least replaces *tuque* where you would expect to find it.

### III. xxiv. 3-6.

noster amor talis tribuit tibi Cynthia, laudes:  
versibus insignem te pudet esse meis.

*mixtam* te varia laudavi saepe figura  
ut quod non esses esse putaret amor.

Could the phrase *mixtam varia figura* be used to describe anything but a monstrosity? And, allowing *mixtam* to be sound, would it carry such an emphasis as to make the author avoid the obvious

laudavi varia mixtam, etc.,

and open his verse with a spondaic disyllable? These are two causes for positive suspicion. Next, the *ut* of v. 6 as well as the *toties* of v. 7 alike require a *tam* in v. 5.

Read:

*His tam te varia laudavi saepe figura*  
ut quod non esses esse putaret amor.

Sc. *his versibus*. 'In these I praised you under so many various styles that my fond fancy deceived itself into imagining you to be what you never were.'

By the way, I venture to call the attention of readers of the *C. R.* to Mr. B. O. Foster's convincing explanation of vv. 11-14 of this same poem (see *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xxx. 1).

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

*The University, Glasgow.*

## NOTES

PLATO, *REPUBLIC*, 614 B.

'Ἀλλ' οὐ μέντοι σοι, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, Ἀλκίονος  
γε ἀπόλογον ἔρω, ἀλλ' ἀλκίμου μὲν ἀν-  
δρός, Ἡρὸς τοῦ Ἀρμενίου, τὸ γένος  
Παμφύλου.

My lamented friend Mr. Adam had collected all the learning ever published about the *Republic*, and I think I am

safe therefore in supposing that the modern commentators are as much in the dark about Er as were the ancients. Illumination may be shed upon him by Moses of Chorene, from whose *Armenian History* (I. 14, 15), translated into French by P. E. le Vaillant de Florival (1841), I collect this fabulous information. Ara was son of Aram, and suc-

ceeded his father as King of Armenia. Semiramis fell in love with him on hearing by report of his beauty, and invaded Armenia, intending to take him prisoner. But Ara was killed in the battle. 'On trouve Ara sans vie au milieu de ses braves compagnons d'armes: Sémiramis le fait déposer à l'étage supérieur de son palais.' She then attempted to bring him back to life by magic arts, but failed. Unwilling to admit failure, 'elle publie cette nouvelle sur le compte d'Ara: "Les dieux en suçant les plaies d'Ara l'ont rendu à la vie."' It certainly looks as if this Ara was the original of Plato's Er; each of them is a valiant Armenian killed in battle, and each is said to be restored to life. For I think that τοῦ Ἀρμενίου originally meant 'the Armenian'; but Plato, having somehow got hold of him under that title, then added in his playful manner τὸ γένος Παμφύλου, because Er in his myth is a type of 'all nations and kindreds and tongues.' So he calls Diotima a Mantinean, punning on μάντις. But it is also possible to suppose that Ἡρὸς τοῦ Ἀρμενίου means 'Ara the son of Aram,' and so the scholiast, who did not see what Παμφύλου meant, explains it as 'son of a man named Armenius.'

One may also well ask what is the force of μέν after ἀλκίμου. It clearly does not correspond to any suppressed δέ; at least it passes my wit to see what the antithesis could be. It seems to me that ἀλλ' ἀλκίμου μέν = ἀλλὰ μὴν ἀλκίμου. μέν and μὴν are originally the same word; ἀλλὰ μέν δὴ continually is equivalent to ἀλλὰ μὴν. There is a passage in Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 428) which seems to settle the existence of this ἀλλὰ—μέν conclusively:

οὐ Βελλεροφόντης· ἀλλὰ κάκεϊνος μέν ἦν<sup>1</sup>  
χωλός, προσαιτῶν, στωμύλος, δεινὸς  
λέγειν.

Here it is practically impossible to say that any δέ clause is suppressed because of the καὶ which goes with ἐκείνος. It is true that we sometimes find μέν and δέ mixed up with other connecting particles, as Xen. *Symph.* ii. 9, ἐν πολλοῖς μέν καὶ ἄλλοις δῆλον καὶ ἐν οἷς δ' ἡ παῖς ποιεῖ—nay, Origen *contra Celsum*, i. 2

<sup>1</sup> Blaydes indeed alters to ἀλλὰ μὴν κάκεϊνος.

actually writes καὶ—μέν, —καὶ—δέ; nobody however would, I think, say that in the Aristophanic passage anything of the kind is involved. It means simply 'not but what my man too was a beggar.' Another very strong instance is *Odyssey*, xv. 405:

οὐ τι περιπληθὴς λίην τόσον, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ  
μέν,

'but good for all that,' where again no δέ can reasonably be supplied. Add [Plato] *Eryxias*, 398 B: οὐ μέντοι ταῦτά γε ξυνέφη ὁ Πρόδικος ἀλλ' ἐκείνα μέν ὡμολόγει. Not so clear, but still very like the others, is Soph. *O.T.* 769, ἀλλ' ἔξεται μέν; but there it is possible to supply a clause like 'but I don't know what he'll say.' Compare further Soph. *O.C.* 44, Plato *Gorg.* 458 B, *Alcib.* I. 106 B, Xen. *Hell.* iv; 34, *Mem.* I. ii. 2, ἀλλ' ἔπαυσε μέν, 'why on the contrary he stopped'; Apollonius Tyanensis, *Epist.*, 8 ad fin., ἀλλὰ τῇ πατρίδι μέν ἔλαβεν ἄν; Julian, *Epist.* 23, ἄλλ' ἐκείνος μέν ἦν οἷος ἦν; but in many of these latter cases, as in Galen (Kühn), vol. iv., p. 787, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μέν, it is very doubtful whether we are dealing with the genuine idiom. Perhaps they are only like the common ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μέν. The three passages from Homer, Plato, and Aristophanes seem to me to show that it was a genuine idiom, though excessively rare.

A sort of halfway house between ἀλλὰ μὴν (or ἀλλὰ μέν δὴ) and ἀλλὰ—μέν is to be found in ἀλλ' οὐ μέν δὴ (e.g. Soph. *Electra*, 103, Lysias, vi. 39).

Thus ἀλλ' ἀλκίμου μέν ἀνδρός means 'but a brave man for all that.'

ARTHUR PLATT.

#### ἘΠΙΓΡΑΦΩ.

UNDER ἔπιγράφω IV. Liddell and Scott write:—'ἐπιγράφαι ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τι, to lend one's name to a thing (as we say), to endorse it, Aeschin. 77. 34; ἑαυτὸν τι, Ael. N.A. 8. 2.' A reference, however, to these passages will show that this is not correct. Aeschines says, *i.e.*, εἰὰν δ' αὐτόματόν τι συμβῇ, προσποιήσεται καὶ σαυτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐπιγράψαι, and the meaning is, 'you will claim as

your own, claim credit for.' So in Aelian, *l.c.* νεκρῷ δὲ ἐντυχὼν (*i.e.* the hound) ἡ λαγὼ ἢ σὺ οὐκ ἂν ᾔψαιτο, τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις ἑαυτὸν πόνοις οὐκ ἐπιγράφων (*non enim se alienis laboribus ascribit*) *i.e.* does not claim credit for the labour of others. To these may be added two passages from Plutarch: καθάπερ ἔργῳ μεγάλῳ δημιουργὸν ἐπιγράφας ἑαυτῷ τὴν Τύχην (of Augustus); II. 319 E. οἶμαι δ' ἂν αὐτὸν (Alexander) εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὴν Τύχην τοῖς κατορθώμασιν αὐτὴν ἐπιγράφουσαν, *i.e.* claiming the credit for his successes. In a word, the idea is not of endorsing another man's bill, but of signing another man's picture.

HERBERT W. GREENE.

4, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

#### AUSONIUS' DEBT TO JUVENAL.

AUSONIUS seems to have felt the influence of Virgil and Horace more than of any other Latin classical poet, and that of Catullus in a less degree. But he knew Juvenal well, as the following references may serve to show:

*Epigrammata* XIII. 3: Non intellecta senectus.

*Id.* XXXV.: Miremur periisse homines? Monumenta fatiscunt,  
Mors etiam saxis nominibusque venit (Juv. *Sat.* x. 146).

*Id.* IV.: Vigilatas accipe noctes (Juv. vii. 27).

*Commemoratio Professorum* I. Dicendi torrens tibi copia (Juv. x. 128).

*Id.* XXII.: Opicas chartas (Juv. iii. 207).

*Epitaphia heroum.* Flos Asiae (Juv. v. 55).

*De XII Caesaribus*: Frater quem Calvum dixit sua Roma Neronem (Juv. iv. 38).

*Sapientes.* Ludiis. Finem intueri longae vitae quo iubet (Juv. x. 275).

*Idyllia* 46: Conditor Iliados (Juv. xi. 180).

He quotes Juvenal at the end of his *Cento Nuptialis*:

Curios simulat et Bacchanalia vivunt.

*Epigrammata* XV.: ipsa senectus  
Expectata diu, votisque optata malig-  
nis (ix. 129).

H. A. STRONG.

Liverpool University.

#### NOTES ON LUCAN, BOOKS V. AND VI.

Book V. l. 86-7.

Quis latet hic superum? Quod numen ab aethere pressum  
Dignatur caecas inclusum habitare cavernas?

Haskins takes 'pressum' as 'forced down from heaven' as though compelled by some superior power. Surely it is here equivalent to 'se premens,' and denotes a voluntary action on the god's part. Taken so it suits the context much better, and fits in admirably with 'dignatur.' 'What divinity, lowering itself from heaven, deigns to dwell in these dark caverns?'

We may compare l. 341 of this same book, 'Numquam sic cura deorum se premit. . . ' 'Never does the care of the gods abase itself so much. . . '

Book V. l. 219-20.

Dumque a luce sacra, qua vidit fata, refertur  
Ad vulgare iubar, mediae venere tenebrae.

Weise, followed by Haskins, takes 'mediae' as 'inter statum furoris divini et receptae mentis humanae.' This makes excellent sense, but surely the poet means, 'inter lucem sacram et vulgare iubar.' As the priestess quits the shrine, forgetfulness came upon her in the leaving, and this is the meaning of the clause introduced by 'dum.' 'Mediae' merely catches up and repeats this previous clause.

Book V. l. 235-6.

Euripusque trahit cursum mutantibus undis  
Chalcidicas puppes ad iniquam classibus Aulin.

('And as the waves change the course of the ships from Chalcis, Euripus draws them to Aulis unkind to fleets.')

Weise, in a note on 'iniquam classibus,' refers to the violence of the tide and winds. This is no doubt true, but surely there is a most distinct literary allusion to the stoppage of Agamemnon at Aulis on the way to Troy. Yet Weise and Haskins say nothing at all about this. We may refer to the first Chorus in Aeschylus *Agamemnon*, and also to a phrase in Horace (*Satires*, II. iii. 205), 'adverso litore,' which Palmer translates, 'on the angry shore.' Surely 'iniquam' here has the same connotation as 'adverso' in the Horace.

Book VI. 566.

... *Compressaque dentibus ora*  
*Laxavit.*

This is generally taken, 'She opened with her teeth the tightly closed mouth.' It is, I think, better to take 'dentibus' with 'compressa,' 'the mouth with

clenched teeth.' Surely the witch opening the mouth with her own teeth calls up a rather impossible picture. The dead man's mouth would naturally be rigid and have the teeth tightly clenched.

W. R. SMALE.

*New College, Oxford.*

## REVIEWS

### WALKER'S ANTI MIAΣ.

'*Avrì Miās. An Essay in Isometry.* By R. J. Walker. Macmillans. 1910. Two vols. Pp. vi, 507, 394.

THIS extraordinary production shows a good deal of reading, much of it of a recondite kind, a great deal of ingenuity, and a great deal of hard work. But alas! all these merits are quenched and confounded by a deplorable lack of common sense and by a headlong audacity of conjectural hypotheses of every sort and description.

The author's objects are two. First to prove that in Greek antistrophic poetry two short syllables may not respond to one long one. Secondly to dispose of all the passages which present this phenomenon.

Unfortunately he confuses these two ends together. So far as I can see he offers no proof whatever of his first thesis except in so far as it is supported by his second. But this is no proof at all. It would be very easy for a man of Mr. Walker's ingenuity and boldness to dispose of all the instances of a dactyl in the first foot of trimeter iambs (*Agam.* 7 and *Antig.* 746 occur to one at once as already so disposed of), but would that prove anything? Not unless the circumstances were such as those pointed out by Bentley or Porson when they laid down the laws concerning anapaestic dimeters and anapaests in iambic trimeter. But in Mr. Walker's case the circumstances are totally different. It is only by the most monstrous and arbitrary violence that he can get rid of the hundreds of exceptions to his rule.

Nor does his hypothesis account for the facts. Let us suppose that the correspondence of two shorts to a long is admitted; what shall we expect? One thing at any rate, that this phenomenon will be commoner in Sophocles and Euripides than in Aeschylus, for everybody knows that Aeschylus is stricter in syllabic correspondence than his successors. Mr. Walker on the contrary says the phenomenon is due to corruption; we should expect then that it will be commoner in Aeschylus. And not only is Aeschylus much more corrupt than Sophocles, but he has a considerably greater quantity of antistrophic verse, the proportion being about eight such lines in Aeschylus to seven in Sophocles. Hence, if Mr. Walker be right, we shall expect the number of violations of his rule in the text of Aeschylus to be something like half as many again as those in the text of Sophocles. Instead of that, we find, taking Mr. Walker's own figures, that there are only 103 instances in Aeschylus to 107 in Sophocles. In Euripides again there are 457, a much greater number than one would anticipate on the corruption theory. But it is obvious that these numbers are quite natural on the ordinary view.

Again the arrangement of the book is very faulty; Mr. Walker just takes the odes of Pindar, Bacchylides and the tragedians, one after another, without distinguishing the rhythms in which they are written. But we might expect to find some difference in this respect. For example, the Dorian odes of Pindar might well be stricter than the Aeolian,



and I should certainly expect them to be stricter than the second Olympian and the fifth Pythian. Mr. Walker lumps them all together; nay, he apparently does not know that there is any difference at all. Never did I see a more astonishing grouping of anything than that which he gives us at vol. i. pp. 70, 71 for the Olympians. 'The second ode alone supplies nine instances,' says he with naïve surprise, and then tells us that ode 'consists of cretics, trochees, (perhaps) spondees, and first, third, and fourth paeons.' Nothing in Pindaric metre is better understood and plainer than the second Olympian, and, as I have already said, it is precisely the ode where we should expect instances of this license; at any rate we all know what an amount of variety we get in Bacchylides when he writes in the same rhythm. Here again the ordinary hypothesis appears to be sound.

Let us take the Dorian or dactylo-epitritic rhythm. Anybody will naturally ask: 'What about the last line of the strophes of the fourth Pythian?' They certainly do not look corrupt. Mr. Walker emends them all thus: 31, for δέϊπν' he reads αἰκν', as a Doric word with the same meaning. 54, for Φοῖβος ἀμνάσει he reads φαβῖς ἀναμνάσει, φαβῖς being supposed to mean a priestess. 108, for Αἰόλφ καὶ he reads ἀν' Ἰαωλκόν. These are certainly ingenious suggestions, but none of them appears to me probable. Rather I should ask why it is that the metrical difficulty recurs thrice precisely at this place of the ode, and I should seek the answer in a musical solution. It is evident that there would be no difficulty in singing a crotchet for two quavers, if both the quavers were on the same note, and it may be suggested (of course merely as a possibility, for we are altogether in the dark about such things) that this responson was only permitted on this condition, at any rate in the Dorian rhythm.<sup>1</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> Even if there is anything in this guess, however, it will only apply to such a case as that of the fourth *Pythian*, where a long syllable is exceptionally substituted for two shorts; there never could be any difficulty musically in substituting two shorts for a long.

does certainly, however, appear that the license is very rare in the true Dorian, and for this rhythm Mr. Walker's case is not so devoid of plausibility. But when we turn to the freer Ionian and Aeolian rhythms he seems to me to break down completely. His emendations are not likely to carry conviction to anybody; what shall we say of ἀραιὸς ἀτμός at *Antig.* 868 ('an unsubstantial wraith') for ἀραιὸς ἀγῆμος, of ἐν τέλει γὰρ ἐστὶ νύξ, ἀφ᾽ τ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἄμαρ ἔρχεται ('then Night is queen and Day draws not near with his torch') at *O.T.* 197, of τίς ἀν δῆτά μοι, τίς ἀμφιστόνων Ἀλιάδων λεχῶν ἀν' αὐτῆς ὕγρας at *Ajax* 879, above all of ἐκγεναθόν for ἐξ ἀντρων at *O.C.* 1571? ἐκγεναθόν refers to Cerberus, who had three heads, and twice three is six according to the mathematicians. Even dochmiacs are not safe from Mr. Walker, who emends them right and left, and has peculiar notions of his own about their metre. A test passage for them is to be found in *Hippolytus* 569-602, where we have four stanzas of five dochmiacs each; it is no wonder that we have not exact syllabic correspondence, and Mr. Walker emends no less than eleven of the twenty lines! If our texts are as bad as all that, what is to be done? But this is nothing to the badness of some of them, it seems. Three (or more) Byzantine scholars of varying degrees of metrical knowledge rewrote the choruses of the *Hercules Furens*, under the eye of a 'great master' (vol. ii. p. 317), I suppose somewhere about the time that Tzetzes was showing the world what he could do in the way of writing Homeric hexameters, for Mr. Walker positively thinks that a great part of these choruses (and of others) was paraphrased into the 'versus politici' of the Byzantine period; the original was consequently lost; then our editor of genius conceived the happy idea of turning back the 'versus politici' into quantitative verses (which nobody at that date could understand); then the 'politici' again were lost, and we now enjoy the finished product of this evolution. He thinks also that the *Electra* of Euripides is spurious from beginning to end, being the composi-

tion of some Alexandrine successor of the Pliad, that the *Rhesus* is a rewritten version of a genuine play of Euripides, that the mimes of Herodas were written by Herodes Atticus, and that the Simon of those mimes (iii. 26) was Simon Peter.

Nevertheless amid this weltering sea of conjecture there are some good things to be found. Mr. Walker certainly does show that all the cases of the responsion he denies should be jealously scrutinized; editors really have been too much in the habit of taking them for granted. And some of his corrections are good. *ἔνευρε* at Bacchylides XVI. 87, *ἐγνευτο* at *Septem* 760 (but that had already been conjectured by Arnaldus), *κιχών* at *Phoenissae* 665 are all highly probable. And no doubt there are more, but the matrix in which they are embedded so abounds in false jewels that it is difficult to look without suspicion even upon the true, and it would take a patient man to hunt for any.

To one unfortunate paragraph I feel bound to call attention, vol. i. p. 110. 'No one can entertain a profounder respect than myself for German scholar-

ship; but it is most unfortunate that consideration of "Metrik" has passed almost exclusively into the hands of a school of thinkers, however eminent, who have not been brought up to practise almost from infancy Latin and Greek verse-composition. Without that practice no man is qualified to deal with the niceties of poetic diction and scansion in the ancient languages. That practice Englishmen in the past have enjoyed. *Sic fortis Etruria crevit.*'

*Sic credit!* The blessings of verse-composition are doubtless great, but they carry with them sometimes a curse. People are apt to think that because they are at home in elegiacs and iambics, they therefore have a supernatural insight into the lyrics of Pindar and Sophocles. If Mr. Walker had never written iambics he might have taken the trouble to learn the difference between the metres of the first and second and sixth Olympian odes, and the men to whom he would have owed this information would have been Germans.

ARTHUR PLATT.

University College, London.

#### MÉLANGES D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE: BIBLIOTHÈQUE DE LA FACULTÉ DES LETTRES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS.

*Mélanges d'Histoire Ancienne: Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris.* No. XXV. Paris: Alcan, 1909. 8vo. One vol. Pp. 391. 4 illustrations in the text. Price 12 fr. 50 c.

This volume contains three essays: M. Bloch writes on M. Aemilius Scaurus (pp. 1-81), M. Carcopino on Ostracism (pp. 83-267), and M. Gernet on the Corn Supply at Athens (pp. 269-391). There is a misprint on the cover and not a few inside it.

M. BLOCH's essay is largely a defence of Scaurus against the insinuations of Sallust, which most historians have accepted without question, though Cicero, Horace, Seneca, Tacitus, and Juvenal regard Scaurus as a model of all Roman virtues, and class him with

Regulus, Scipio, Rutilius Rufus, and even Cato. That Scaurus was 'avidus divitiarum' cannot indeed be denied: his early poverty and later wealth, the anecdote in Cicero *De Oratore* (II. 70. 283), the statement of Asconius that his son's rapacity was 'paternum genus morum,' and the curious phrase of Pliny (*N. H.* 36. 116) 'provincialium rapinarum sinus' fully support Sallust. But corruption by a foreign potentate is a very different matter, and M. Bloch contends that Scaurus was guiltless in his relations with Jugurtha. Sallust, he argues, is notoriously prejudiced against the optimates; the appointment of Scaurus on the Mamilian Quaestio shows that he was regarded as innocent; and lastly, his conduct in the Jugurthine War can be satisfactorily explained. He merely followed the traditional Sena-

torial policy which preferred client princes to provinces. He supports Adherbal during the latter's life, as two princes are easier to keep in order than one; but after his death the choice lies between recognising Jugurtha and annexing, and Scaurus prefers the former course. Jugurtha could never be a serious menace to Rome, and to set up another claimant would be costly and troublesome.

M. Bloch makes his view highly probable, if he does not quite prove it. It should be remembered that Scaurus was subsequently accused under the Varian law of treasonable correspondence with Mithridates, and a little earlier 'ob legationis Asiaticae invidiam,' which is here interpreted as an embassy to Mithridates about 104 B.C. And in both cases he avoids trial. But accusations are too common a political weapon at this period and the incidents too obscure to lend much support to Sallust.

In any case M. Bloch has in this minute and careful study made a valuable contribution to an obscure period of history. On two constitutional points we would differ from him: he apparently regards special 'quaestiones' as 'privilegia' (p. 59), though in this case the penalty is neither 'nominatime' nor yet 'sine iudicio constituta' (*De Domo* 17. 43). And he thinks that the Senatorial 'quaestio' on the adherents of Ti. Gracchus was the first of its kind. But even if the Bacchanalian 'quaestio' may be otherwise explained, and the Roman matrons of 180 B.C. were merely women, the 'publicani' of 138 B.C. (*Cic. Brutus* 22. 85) furnish an earlier example.

M. Carcopino in his elaborate study of ostracism examines minutely its origin, development, and procedure; discusses all its known cases, with special attention to chronology, distinguishing 'les ostracisés imaginaires' (Cleisthenes, Callias, Miltiades, the son of Cimon and Damon) and 'les victimes réelles'; and concludes with a lengthy epilogue on Hyperbolus and the disuse of the procedure, which he attributes to the political clubs.

On the vexed question whether the 6,000 votes were a quorum or a majority, he pronounces for a majority. He allows too little weight to the equation  $\xi\gamma\alpha\kappa\iota\sigma-$

$\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omicron\iota = \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  'Αθηναῖοι (And. iv. 4, and more explicitly Dem. xxiv. 46 and 48). That equation has some meaning if 6,000 is the whole assembly; for the whole Ecclesia may without impropriety be regarded as the whole Athenian people. Further, the whole body of dikasts is called  $\xi\gamma\alpha\kappa\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omicron\iota$  (And. i. 17. 'Αθπ. 24): whether we believe them to have been  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  'Αθηναῖοι (Harp. s.v. Ardettos), or distinguish with Lipsius (*Att. Recht*, i. 135, 144) the practice of the fifth and fourth centuries, matters little. Lastly, Thuc. viii. 72 certainly supports the quorum. Dem. xxiv. 45 may perfectly well mean 'unless the  $\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$  is passed by an assembly of 6,000 at the least,' as in the ordinary phrase  $\psi\eta\phi\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{\eta}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ .

Among the 'ostracisés imaginaires' is placed Damon, we think on insufficient grounds. It is impossible, we are told, to find a date for his ostracism (a dangerous argument for use in the Pentecontaetia), he was too obscure to be ostracised, and the words in 'Αθπ. 27. 4. relating to the ostracism of Damonides (who is to be identified with Damon, though without the emendation of Wilamowitz), are interpolated: for they are not quoted by Plutarch, who quotes the rest of the passage. The phrase is due to those same oligarchs who vainly imagined the Draconian Constitution, and is an attempt to discredit Pericles and his circle. Now not only is this extremely far-fetched, but the three passages of Plutarch remain absolutely untouched by this argument: for Plutarch distinguished Damon and Damonides, and therefore his twice-reiterated statement that Damon was ostracised is quite unaffected by the genuineness or the reverse of this passage.

The ostracism of Hyperbolus is explained by a combination of the theories of Zurborg and Volquardsen: two stages are distinguished, and Phaeax is treated as a mere puppet of Nicias. The theory explains the facts after a fashion, but is too conjectural for general acceptance.

An elementary mistake occurs on p. 171, where we read that Callias 'fut chargé, en qualité d'ambassadeur, de renouer avec le grand roi Artaxerxès, l'alliance contractée avec Xerxès.' This

may be a slip, but in view of the importance of Her. vii. 151, it is a regrettable slip.

Apart from these points, M. Carcopino's treatise is valuable as a complete statement and careful examination of the evidence.

For M. Gernet we have little space left. In his first chapter he examines the population of Athens, which is estimated at 500,000 to 600,000 souls, the annual consumption, which is reckoned at 7 μέδιμοι per head, in all  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 4 million μέδιμοι, and the production of Attica, which is conjectured to have been 600,000 μέδιμοι at the most, leaving at least 3 millions to be imported. The question of population is dealt with somewhat perfunctorily: neither the theories of Beloch and Meyer, nor the passages of Thucydides are patiently examined.

Chapter II. enumerates the corn-exporting countries, Chapter III. contains what little is known of the σι:οπῶλαι and ἔμποροι, their attempts at 'cornering,' and their relations, generally amicable, with the Government. In Chapter IV. the attitude of the state towards the question of corn supply is discussed at great length. Authorities are quoted and used with a care which other writers on ancient economics would do well to imitate.

Two old-established theories are combated by M. Gernet. He believes that Pontic corn was of little importance to Athens in the fifth and early

fourth centuries, and only becomes important owing to the personal policy of Demosthenes: also that Athens was seldom in danger of famine: corn came there from abroad spontaneously: artificial stimulus from the Government was unnecessary, as is proved by the fact that corn actually paid the πεντηκοστή, and that two-thirds of the imported quantity sufficed to feed the population. The laws which prescribed μὴ σιτηγεῖν ἄλλοσε ἢ Ἀθήναιζε were conceived mainly in the interests of the revenue.

We have only space for the first point: the second we commend to M. Ferrero. If authorities are silent about Pontic corn, they are equally silent about corn from elsewhere: the argument proves too much. *C.I.A.* i. 40 (attributed on p. 318 to the end of the Peloponnesian War, on p. 357, note 1, to the year 428) shows that the Pontic corn trade was in Athenian hands and was jealously guarded: how M. Gernet can make it mean the opposite, we cannot understand. Lysias xxii. 14 shows that Pontic was the stock example of foreign corn: and finally, the nervousness of Athens about the Hellespont from the day after Salamis onwards is only explicable if something vitally important came from there. Nor was the Pontic expedition of Pericles a mere reaction against the 'parti de l'ouest,' but the traditional policy of Athens since Peisistratus.

H. J. CUNNINGHAM.

Worcester College, Oxford.

## DIE ENSTEHUNG DER ODYSSEE UND DIE VERSABZAHLUNG IN DEN GRIECHISCHEN EPEN.

*Die Entstehung der Odyssee und die Versabzählung in den griechischen Epen:* von AUGUST FICK. 1910. Teubner.

THIS is a reprint of the well-known 'Wiederherstellung' of the *Odyssey*, published in 1883, with a preface of twelve pages, dated October, 1909. The author bears a name which I presume I am right in saying will always be great in the history of Comparative Philology; but his application of his linguistic knowledge to written texts and the history

of literature has not yielded permanent results. Indeed, in the former department, he has shown singular violence, and scholars of far less than his attainments have known better how to balance the claims of manuscript tradition and phonetic law; in fact, except ἦχον in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes 400, it may be doubted if any alteration under his name will be found in future editions. In the history of literature it is of course by his theory that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (and most of later



heroic epos also) were composed in Aeolic, and subsequently by one means or another turned into their actual dialect, called Old Ionic by the Greeks, that he is best known. Of the great *flambée* which attended this speculation when it was published thirty years ago, a very small pinch of gray ash is now left. The best that can be said for it, by a candid dialectologist but involved in old vested interests, will be found in Cauer's *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* ed. 2. In this country it was received with mistrust, as contradicting all the tendencies of the Greek mind in literature; the phonetic facts on which it rested have been recently given an entirely different complexion by Paul Kretschmer (KZ. xxxi., 1898, *Glotta* i., 1907), and an expert like Bechtel has publicly disavowed it (*Die Vokal-kontraktion bei Homer*, 1908). If the criteria which distinguish historical Aeolic and Ionic were (as to Ionic at least) the result of contact with the natives of Caria (Kretschmer's hypothesis), these dialectal terms at the epoch of the Colonisation disappear. There also disappear any connexion between epos and the Aeolic race as such—Lesbos, Tenedos, Thessaly, Boeotia; 'North-Greek epos,' the *Rückspiegelung* of the Aeolic colonisers, our old friend the Thessalian horse (a worthy companion to the Iliadic vine and the Odyssean fig) Pharsalus-Phthia, and Larissa and the Pelasgic Argos. The picture, first drawn by Monro (*Odyssey*, xiii.-xxiv., Appendix, 1901, paper at the Archaeological Congress, Rome, 1903), which results from Kretschmer's account of Ionic, is of an epos in the Greek mainland—and doubtless in the Peloponnese, since the political centre of gravity lies between Achaea and Triphylia, and the home of the Muses is at Dorion in Triphylia. This passed eastward with the Achaeon colonisers, and in their new home was given an abiding shape first in two long poems and afterwards in various shorter ones. The language of all these poems is materially the same, and if the latest Cyclic poet used the language of the *Iliad*, some compelling cause must be found to account for the canonisation of this vehicle—and what but the genius of the author

of the two oldest poems? (The parallel with Dante, unnoticed by our German friends, was made by Monro.) Homer arrested the Ionian tongue at a moment when the influence of the Carian and Asian home had begun to work but had not completely modified the Achaeon speech. The digamma, as a symbol, had gone, and *η* had largely supplanted *ā*, but the language was a long way from the fifth-century dialect which the Greeks called New Ionic, and still retained much which agreed on the one hand with the oldest Attic, on the other with historical Aeolic. This stage of Ionic began and remained the language of epos; the Dorian races knew Homer as the *Ἰωνικός ποιητής* and he imposed his medium on his latest successors.

The poems came to the birth in Old Ionic; in Old Ionic they were propagated over the Greek world, with surface-changes, mostly in the direction of New Ionic and Attic, incidental to oral and clerical tradition. They never had, at birth or in transmission, connexion with Aeolic. This great error was the result of a misreading of language.

The reprinting of this book was uncalled for, but the preface deserves our sympathy and respect. An idea, even if unsuccessful, clears the ground and stimulates thought. In the Homeric Question Fick's place comes after that of Wolf.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

The publication in *Harper's Magazine*, January, 1911, of a partial reading of the Phaestos disk as Greek, by Professor Hempl, suggests one or two reflections.

Assuming the correctness of Mr. Hempl's method and results, I notice that both he and Mr. Arthur Evans believe that the disk came from Lycia. Therefore about 1600 B.C. the Lycians spoke this sort of Greek. Now, on consulting Kretschmer's well-known *Einleitung*, I find that the language of Lycia and Caria are materially the same. Homer, in the *Catalogue*, calls the Carians *Βαρβαρόφωνοι*, an epithet which he gives to no other Asiatics, and which clearly cannot be applied to the

speech of the disk. Therefore it would seem that the Carians and Lycians in general spoke a language other than Greek; and again, that the Greek of the disk must have been spoken by a part of the Lycians, not the whole. Here we naturally think of the genealogy of Glaucus in Z, where he expounds how both he and Sarpedon were descended from Sisyphus of Ephyra, through the emigrant Bellerophon. The Greek element in Lycia was therefore dynastic. They spoke the language of the disk, the nation generally and the Carians did not.

Now Bellerophon is a very type of Märchen-hero, as märchenhaft as Joseph or Hippolytus. Yet in substance he appears historical. This reflection I commend to the correspondent who first told me of Mr. Hempl's paper. To critics of the Oxford *Odyssey*, I venture to point out that, supposing the transcription correct, we have the article used articularly, and the genitive of -o stems ending in -ov, at the remote date of 1600 B.C.

T. W. ALLEN.

Queen's College, Oxford.

#### RECENT CLASSICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- (1) *Rudolf Klussmann: Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum*. Vol. I., part 1. Pp. 708. 8vo. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1909. 18m.
- (2) *Catalogus Dissertationum Philologicarum Classicarum*. Ed. 2. Pp. 652. Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1910. 7.20m.
- (3) *Altclassische Philologie und Altertumskunde, Antiquariats-Katalog*. No. 379. Pp. 665. Ulm: Heinrich Kerler.

FOR our knowledge of the latest publications in the field of classical literature many of us have to rely on the quarterly numbers of the *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, begun in 1874, and now published by O. R. Reisland, of Leipzig. This is supplied *gratis* to all subscribers to Bursian's *Jahresbericht* and to the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, but is, apparently, not sold separately. There is an index for each year; and if, from time to time, these indexes were combined in a separate volume, we should have a convenient conspectus of the classical literature of the period covered in the volume.

(1) The same publishers have now produced, as a supplement to Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, the first instalment of an elaborate and comprehensive bibliography of the literature of classical studies from 1878 to 1896 inclusive. In a volume extending to little more than 700 pages, we here have all the

editions of each author, together with all the dissertations and the articles in classical periodicals dealing with that author. The first 158 pages are devoted to the literature of large classes of authors, such as the *Poetae Scenici* and the *Scriptores Philosophi*, and, in the case of some of the more comprehensive works, we have even a conspectus of their tables of contents. The next 544 pages comprise the literature of all Greek authors from Abercius to Homer. This last item covers more than 100 pages. Although the period embraced in the volume ends, nominally, with 1896, it is extended so as to include later editions of works published in or before that year. Even the price of each item is stated. Within its limits the volume is completely satisfactory. The editor is Dr. Rudolf Klussmann, a retired schoolmaster now resident in Munich, whose favourite study (according to the German *Who's Who?*) is, fortunately for ourselves, classical bibliography. In the preface he gratefully acknowledges the aid he has received from Dr. Postgate and other scholars.

(2) A more limited field is covered by the *Catalogus Dissertationum*, published by Gustav Fock, of Leipzig. But, within its limits, it is much more than a bookseller's catalogue: it is a bibliographical achievement. The 18,300 items of the first edition of 1892 have now risen to no less than 27,400. The

first 400 pages are filled with lists of dissertations on Greek and Latin authors, twenty-three being taken up with Homer and eighteen with Cicero. The remaining 250 pages include dissertations on classical education, history of literature, of philosophy, and of scholarship, history and geography, epigraphy and palaeography, architecture, numismatics, and antiquities in the widest sense of the word. The volume ends with an index. It supplies a very full conspectus of the separate dissertations dealing with the several classical authors and with the various departments of classical learning. Plato fills eighteen pages.

(3) We may conclude by mentioning

the elaborate catalogue printed within the last few years by Heinrich Kerler, of Ulm. This supplies in 665 pages a very comprehensive list of editions of classical authors, as well as dissertations upon them. The literature of Homer alone fills twenty-three pages. Heinrich Kerler was once visited by the distinguished Homeric scholar, the late Mr. D. B. Monro, who asked him why he did not remove his emporium to one of the great literary centres of Germany, such as Leipzig. The bookseller replied that nothing would induce him to leave a place where he could enjoy the constant opportunities of swimming in such a delightful stream as the river Danube.

J. E. SANDYS.

#### ARISTOTLE DE GENERATIONE ANIMALIUM.

*Aristotle de Generatione Animalium.*

Translated by A. PLATT. 8vo. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. 7s. 6d. net.

THE Oxford translation of Aristotle is making good progress. Mr. Ross's *Metaphysics* is now followed, at no long interval, by the volume before us, in which Mr. Platt disposes of nearly 200 pages of Bekker's text—another solid chunk of the Aristotelian corpus. In some respects Mr. Platt's task has been simpler than that of several of the other translators: the text is, on the whole, fairly sound, and the style fairly simple. But Mr. Platt has aimed at producing something more and better than a bare verbal rendering: where there is any difficulty or obscurity in the argument he appends a note, and it is in these numerous, though concise, footnotes, full as they are of zoological information, illustration, and criticism, that the main interest of the volume lies. The command of both fact and theory regarding natural history which Mr. Platt here displays is indeed extraordinary in an amateur, and a proof of remarkable industry and versatility. Those of us who cannot claim even a bowing acquaintance with ascidians and cephalopoda *et hoc genus omne* can only

congratulate ourselves and Aristotle on the emergence of an editor so amply equipped for the task of dealing with the mysteries which concern their generation.

With the English of Mr. Platt's translation it would be difficult to find any serious fault. It is seldom that one comes across a passage which is at all wanting in clearness. An exceptional instance is ch. 2 *ad init.*: 'Of the generation of animals we must speak as various questions arise in order in the case of each,' where the English does not seem to make much sense: the Greek runs, *λεκτέον κατὰ τὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα λόγον καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν*. Does, then, *κατὰ τὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα λόγον* mean 'as the various questions arise in order'? Certainly Philoponus (whom Mr. Platt appears never to cite) does not suggest this meaning when he paraphrases *ἐπιβάλλοντα* by *τὸν ἀρμόδιον καὶ προσήκοντα*. Later on in the same chapter Philoponus supplies the right meaning for *περίνεος*, with regard to which, as Mr. Platt observes, L. and S. need correction. At I. 6. 718<sup>a</sup>7 (*οὐκ οὖν δεῖ ἐν τῷ συνδυασμῷ τὸ σπέρμα πέττειν αὐτούς, . . . ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς ὥρας τὸ σπέρμα πεπεμμένον ἀθρόον ἔχουσιν κ.τ.λ.*) Mr. Platt renders, 'They have it all matured together before the time,' reading *πρὸ*

for ὑπο: this is a plausible emendation, but it is worth noting that Philoponus comments: ὑπὸ τῆς ὥρας, λέγων ὥραν τὸ ἔαρ' τότε γὰρ οὗτοι συνδνάζονται. At I. 13. 720<sup>a</sup>33 Mr. Platt writes, 'By omitting ἅμα τοῖς πόροις I hope I have restored sense to Aristotle; to combine Greek and sense in the received text would puzzle Diels himself': but perhaps we should emend rather than omit—at any rate, Philoponus has ἅμα τοῖς ὀρχεσιν in his paraphrase. Another place where Philoponus sheds light on the meaning is I. 15. 720<sup>b</sup>35: Mr. Platt renders (the brackets are mine)—'It is not an organ useful for generation, for it is outside the passage <in the male>, and indeed outside the body <of the male altogether>,' and he is clearly right as regards the sense, though he does not cite in his support Philoponus's comment. For the note on 722<sup>b</sup>7 also a reference might have been made to the same authority. In I. 19 we come upon two other places where Philoponus confirms Mr. Platt—viz., with regard to the meaning of αἰμορροῖδες (727<sup>a</sup>13) and the omission of παρὰ (727<sup>b</sup>10). The 'foolish remark' in II. viii. 748<sup>a</sup>20 (διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι συνεχῶς φέρειν) which Mr. Platt ejects is construed by Philoponus as applying to the male (φέρειν = φέρειν γονήν, cp. 776<sup>b</sup>16) a possibility which is at least worth noting. Among the many difficult passages where plausible, if not certain, corrections are proposed, special attention may be called to II. i. 732<sup>a</sup>10, 734<sup>b</sup>23; II. iii. 737<sup>a</sup>8, πνεῦμα for σπέρμα (? σῶμα, with σπέρματος in the next line); II. iv. 739<sup>b</sup>11,

κωνικά for ἀκόνιτα; II. viii. 747<sup>b</sup>22, ἀνόμοιον ὄν for ὅμοιον; III. xi. 763<sup>a</sup>23, μείζους for πλείους, 763<sup>b</sup>3 ὁμόρους for ὁμοίους; V. 2. 781<sup>b</sup>2. In a few places Mr. Platt seems needlessly suspicious: thus on II. 4. 740<sup>b</sup>10 he comments 'ἐν αὐτοῖς is probably corrupt . . . Qu. ἐν ταῖς ὑστέραις or the like'; but the simple addition of a comma after ἀπολυθῶσιν is sufficient, I think, to restore sense to the passage (cp. Philoponus *ad loc.*): again, at 750<sup>a</sup>22 τὰ φά seems a superfluous emendation. On the other hand, no correction is proposed for such an obscure passage as V. i. 780<sup>a</sup>8 ('liquid is in general hard to move in the night'): perhaps the transposition of ἐν τῇ νυκτί to a place in the preceding sentence (after κινεῖται) might afford some easement.

But enough of detail. The textual and critical work is admirable, on the whole, for both acuteness and sanity of judgment; and no less admirable, as has been said, are the ancient and modern instances with which the zoology is illustrated.

In the amount of room allowed him for annotations Mr. Platt is more fortunate than were some of his predecessors, and we are grateful to the editors of the series for their increasing liberality in this respect. To have crowded out, for instance, such a *mot* as that in the last note on II. viii. ('mules are fertile of fiction if of nothing else') would have been little short of a crime.

R. G. BURY.

Trumpington.

#### CTPΩΜΑΤΕΙΣ.

CTPωματεῖς. Grazer Festgabe zur 50. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner. Pp. 172, Graz: Leuschner u. Lubensky. 1909.

THIS memorial volume contains a number of interesting papers of which we can do little more than give the subjects and authors' names. 'On the Formation of the I. G. Comparative,' by Rudolph Meringer, dealing with the comparative of πολὺς; 'On the Attic

Law of Intestacy,' by Arthur Ledl; 'Horace, *Sat.* I. 3,' by A. Goldbacher, comments on verses 7 sq, 25, 31, 56; 'A post-Justinian Judgment on papyrus,' by Leopold Wenger, on Pap. Ox. VI. n. 893; 'The Topography of the Carthaginian Mercenary War,' by G. Veith (illustrated); 'Q. Aelius Tubero, the pupil of Panaetius, as author of an astronomical and meteorological work,' by Otto Cuntz; 'Polybios and Livy on Greek Monarchs and Monarchy,'



by Adolf Bauer; 'Athene,' by Karl Schriebl, 'Ἀθήνη' is to be derived from  $\eta + \chi\theta\eta\mu + i\tilde{\alpha}$  i.e. 'die Innerirdische'; 'On Ovid, *Met.* II. 138 sqq.' ('tortum—anguem'), by Rudolf Wimmerer; 'Zu den krabanisch-kermischen Glossen,' by J. Stalzer, analysis of the glossary published by Steinmeyer in vol. I. of his *Old High German glosses and Goetz* in vol. IV. of the *Corp. Gloss.*; 'Aphorisms on Rhythmical Reading,' by R. C. Kukula, criticisms upon current

methods of reading Latin verse; 'A Byzantine Translation of Ovid's *Amatory Poems*,' by Heinrich Schenk, excerpts from *Cod. Neapolitanus* c. II. 32 (circa 1400); 'The Latin Hexameter with incisio post quartum trochaicum,' by Julius Cornu; 'Johannes Hus as a reformer of Latin Orthography,' by Matthias Musko; 'Sprachgeschichtliche Werte,' by Hugo Schuchardt, general observations upon language and linguistic psychology.

## SHORT NOTICES

*Essai sur la Composition du Roman Gallois de Peredur.* Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris pour le Doctorat d'Université par MARY RH. WILLIAMS, M.A., Fellow of the University of Wales. 1 vol. Pp. vi+123. 10" x 6½". Paris: Honoré Champion. 3 fr. 50 c.

THIS brochure affords an interesting example of the Higher Criticism applied with signal success to Old Celtic romance. The authoress dedicates her work to M. Joseph Vendryes, of the Sorbonne, well known to readers of the *Classical Review* for his work on Greek and Latin accentuation, and to Celtic philologists for his admirably complete and brilliant *Grammaire du Vieil Irlandais*. Miss Williams has carefully examined the various versions of the Percival Legend, with special reference to the Welsh *Peredur* as given in the *Red Book of Hergest* and *The White Book of Rhydderch*, of which diplomatic editions have been published by that incomparable maker of beautiful books, Mr. J. Gwenogvryn Evans.

After carefully comparing the Welsh versions with one another and with the poems of Chrétien and Wolfram, Miss Williams reaches the following conclusions: (1) The Welsh version is neither a translation nor an adaptation of the French romance; (2) it is a contamination of three different stories, one of which is a copy of a French poem dealing with the Holy Grail.

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

University College, Bangor.

*History, Authority, and Theology.* By the REV. A. C. HEADLAM, D.D. Pp. ix+329. London: John Murray, 1909. Price 6s. net.

IN this volume the Principal of King's College has collected a series of essays on questions in dogmatic and historical theology. They are concerned with a defence and restatement of the Gospel, dealing only with certain aspects of the subject, since the writer's intention of publishing a more comprehensive work has been thwarted by the pressure of affairs. The ecclesiastical standpoint is firmly Anglican, the doctrinal point of view is such as will commend itself to the central body of the English Church, but the space devoted to the Eastern Churches is significant of the author's sympathies. In his treatment of historical investigation he recognises the great services which have been rendered by foreign scholars, especially Harnack, but for his own part takes his stand quite decidedly with Bishop Lightfoot. It is inevitable that in handling such thorny subjects controversy should be rather prominent, and Dr. Headlam deals faithfully with tendencies which he believes to be of a mischievous character, such as what is rather oddly known as 'The New Theology.' But leaving aside the controversial aspects of the book, on which it would be out of place to express an opinion here, it may be said that Dr. Headlam has given us an able and learned volume in which he expresses with clearness and decision the views

to which his prolonged study have led him. If one part of the volume rather than another should be selected for special praise it should perhaps be the historical articles at the close on 'Methods of Early Church History' and 'The Church of the Apostolic Fathers.' But the lecture on dogmatic theology contains an excellent statement and defence of the conviction that religion cannot do other than create a theology. Perhaps the author may yet find time to give us the larger work which he contemplated.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

*La première Églogue de Virgile.* Commentaire donnée en partie dans le cours de vacances à l'Université de Louvain en 1902. By EDM. REMY. 1 vol. Pp. xx+159. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1910.

THIS book is an example of method. The author wishes to show how he would teach what presumably we should call a Fifth Form a work like the First Eclogue. The proportion of about two pages of exposition to one line of text seems rather beyond the requirements of this clientèle, but as the editor says when treating of the technique of Virgil: 'Je ne me suis pas borné strictement aux seuls faits communicables aux élèves. Le professeur évidemment doit savoir plus que ceux-ci.' Eighty-four pages, or practically half the volume, are devoted to commentary on the text: the rest is given up to excursions on the form of the eclogue, its circumstances, the peculiarities of its diction and metrical composition, and the extent of the poet's originality. In the hands of the teacher, perhaps its most useful part is to be found in the suggestions given about reading the Latin aloud so as to show its dramatic meaning, its grammatical balance, and its rhythmical beauties, though it is not every master who would be wise in encouraging his form to guess the emotion that his tone of voice was intended to convey. The account given of the social and economic conditions of the time, as illustrated

by the poor freeman and slave, supplies useful suggestion in teaching. A more advanced student than the Fifth Form boy would find the book helpful, though there is nothing about the MSS., and grammatical difficulties are not dealt with at all fully: not the least of the advantages that he would gain would be the constant references to larger works. The work is somewhat carelessly printed, and there are other errors for which the printer is not responsible. Why, in the passage 36-39, is the use of 'vocares' and 'vocabant' together called an oxymoron? We feel relieved when the editor says of this: 'Mais je ne le signalerais pas aux élèves.'

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

*A Chapter in the Story of Roman Imperialism.* By TENNEY FRANK. Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, 1909. Pp. 118-138.

IN the discussion of imperialism *v.* nationalism, of expansion *v.* the sovereign rights of other States, the Romans of Augustus' day were vastly ahead of their own countrymen of the third to second centuries B.C. For instance, in reading Livy on the Macedonian Wars it is absolutely necessary to make due allowance for an interval of 200 years, rich in the acquisition of an empire, rich in such theories of justification as the holding of empire brings to a nation; separate out the acquired imperial ideas in Livy's narrative, and the residuum gives us the political thoughts current in 200 B.C. Such is in brief Mr. Tenney Frank's method, and it is a right one; only due allowance must be made for what has been lost as well as for what has been acquired. We do not agree that the Roman diplomacy of 200 B.C. was simple (p. 118); it may appear so, because much has been lost which is not recoverable.

The author would mark a change from a fairly consistent Roman policy of abstention in the East to one of interference, some time between 200 and 190 B.C. We should hesitate to

point to a change of policy at any particular point. For ourselves we should be inclined to put earlier than does the author the idea of acquiring undue influence by setting up pro-Roman oligarchies in the free cities of Greece; but ideas must have been as confused as were actions between 229 and 167 B.C. Mr. Tenney Frank presupposes a little too much consistency and simplicity at Rome. The balance of parties at home and abroad would seem to have been delicate, and the Romans appear acting in an unselfish or in a grasping spirit greatly according to the exigencies of the moment. The whole impression of Roman action in the East is that of living from hand to mouth, and this must modify the author's tendency to reduce everything to too easy a level of consistency. Otherwise this pamphlet is interesting, if somewhat slight.

We should like to ask two questions. Is the evidence on p. 122 *sq.* sufficient to show that Rome meant to deal in a spirit of equality with her *amici* down to so late a date as 190 B.C.? Again, at what figure would a Roman noble in a communicative mood have put the profits of a little war in the East, and that without any question of bribery or embezzlement? The passage in Livy xxxi. 6, where the Senate forces the unwilling comitia to take up the Second Macedonian War (for the benefit of the noble generals?), shows that the rank and file at Rome were not at one with the Senate on eastern questions. Here again is a cross-current, which makes the conception of a simple or consistent Roman policy hard to believe.

LOUISE E. MATTHAEI.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

#### AGATHOCLES.

*Agathocles, Cambridge Historical Essays.* No. XV. By H. J. W. TILLYARD. Pp. 326. Index. Cambridge University Press, 1908.

As a collection of correct information well arranged this book is excellent. Mr. Tillyard has been at pains to secure every piece of our scanty information

about Agathocles.<sup>1</sup> His equipment as a scholar is so good, that we may rely without misgiving on his general valuation of evidence: as historian his verdict on Agathocles is sane and reasonable. It is a relief to come across so trustworthy a piece of work. Yet it seems a pity that a life so exciting as was Agathocles' in the living should prove a little dull in the telling; Fortune has been niggardly: there is not so much as an authentic portrait of Agathocles, and the recital of his history in such inferior writers as Diodorus, Polyaeus, and Justin is not very convincing. In character he was a rather commonplace mixture of brutality, cruelty, and also of treachery, in fortunes a mere adventurer and no statesman. Mr. Tillyard has made the best narrative possible out of the materials, and, in particular, has told the story of the campaigns in Africa with much skill. The only point in which he has not been full enough is in bringing Agathocles into relation with his times, and showing him typical of some of the less pleasing features of his age.

The photographs of scenery from the author's own camera are a pleasant feature of the book, and the description of the battle-ground by the Himera is from his personal observation, so that he has every right to bring forward his own explanation of the battle.

L. E. MATTHAEI.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

*The Latins in the Levant: a History of Frankish Greece, 1204-1566.* By William Miller, M.A. Murray.

MR. MILLER is already known by an able book on near-eastern politics. Here he takes a new topic, one much neglected, both complex and difficult, but very necessary to the understanding of modern history. The only recent book in English that touches upon medieval Greek history is Sir Rennell Rodd's *Princes of Achaia*. Yet the subject is highly instructive, and there are abundant materials in print, as well as whole

<sup>1</sup> Except coinage, which is expressly excluded.

libraries in manuscript. Crete alone would fill more than one volume. It is strange that young scholars do not turn their attention to this field.

The story is complex, as I said, but full of humanity. The adventures of many a one of these medieval chieftains would make a story as good as Alexander Gardner's. We are often reminded of the English and French adventurers in India, before India came under government. Mr. Miller has not space to give these stories in full: amidst his mass of chronicles he can only hint at them. Perhaps some novelists will take the hint. We should be glad of a few works that turned on something else than kisses and gush. Although Mr. Miller has all these facts to deal with, he does his task with spirit and imagination; many a scene lingers in the memory, not a few names call up the picture of a man.

Vividly in these pages do we see the might of the old seafaring states, Genoa and Venice, which have left their traces in great castles all over the

Levant. The fighting religious orders, and great Latin families, whose names are not yet extinct, play a great part in the drama. All through the wars and troubles of these centuries there was some kind of government and ordered society, the roots of life which might have grown to greatness; but with the Turkish conquest all is changed. The Turks, with their cynical contempt for all but their own aggrandisement, left behind only the ignorant and the humble. It is their destruction of the ruling class that has made the modern revival of Greece so difficult, and has caused its weakness.

Mr. Miller is not quite a pioneer in this history, but he works from original authorities (a good bibliography is appended), and he has earned our gratitude. It is not to be expected that future research will not improve upon his work, or correct it; but the reader may trust it as an honest and careful account of a time of which little is known.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

## VERSION

'WHITHER AWAY?'—A REPLY.

MISTRESS, I go the beaten way,  
The way that many a one has trod;  
On, on, and on until the day  
That lays me 'neath the sod.

No faery gleam, no magic light,  
An arid track, a sky of gray—  
Patience and courage infinite  
My only hope and stay.

ELLA FULLER MAITLAND.

(In *The Spectator*,  
September 7th, 1901, p. 317.)

'QUO VADIS?'

Quo vadam, rogitas; eo, Lycori,  
Quo multi prius ire perstiterunt.  
Pergendum'st sine fine, donec adsit  
Quae me caespite lux suprema condat.  
Non stellis via, non nitore dio  
Collucet polus. Aret usquequaque  
Sublustris Iove callis: ire tantum  
Constanter manet, ire, nec minorem  
Aerumnis inopemve me fateri.

D. A. S.



## NOTES AND NEWS

It is very interesting that the Municipality of Rome should offer a prize for the best copy of Latin verses; but in view of the attitude of modern scholarship it is also rather surprising. Germany cares nothing for these elegant arts; America in this, as in other educational matters, follows the lead of Germany; and in France apparently schoolboys are to learn only French. Unless Italy, fortified by the example of Leo XIII., has kept the sacred fire alive in her seats of learning, England (where some skill in composition has always and justly been held to be part of the equipment of a scholar) must be the Latin versifiers' last asylum. Even here he must apologise for his existence to critics who have no taste or aptitude for what they call useless accomplishments. Still there are some even among our younger scholars who are well able to support the best traditions of an 'old-fashioned' classical education; and we hope that they are competing for the prize. The subject may still inspire, though it cannot be called exactly novel.

Defeated last term on the larger issue, the assailants of 'compulsory Greek' at Oxford are to renew the attack in another form. This time, what is demanded is exemption for boys who intend to be candidates in the Honour School of Natural Science, and therefore, as it is alleged, are unable to learn the rudiments of Greek. A petition to this effect has been sent to the Hebdomadal Council, signed by about 200 members of the congregation. The 200, however, are not quite unanimous; for instance, the Regius Professor of Medicine signs with the proviso that he does not wish students of Medicine to be relieved from Greek. Council will have some difficulty in framing a statute on the lines desired by the petitioners. If they relieve medical students from Greek, they disregard the wishes of perhaps the most important signatory. If they exempt everyone else and leave medical students *in statu quo*, the statute will be illogical and even absurd.

At their December meeting, the Headmasters' Conference passed a resolution,

which, so far as its meaning appeared after discussion, allowed an option for certain classes of students. It is unfortunate that the Conference never allows time enough for full discussion; but it must be admitted that hardly any speakers defended compulsory Greek. Such a subject, however, crucial for the matter of education, ought to be discussed in all its bearings, its merits or demerits, and the results of the proposed change. Sir E. Ray Lankester has no doubt in his own mind. His address to the Science Masters last month bore the title of *Compulsory Greek versus Compulsory Science*, which shows that regards the two as incompatible. Why do so many on both sides take this line?

Why, indeed, are there two sides? A proper scheme of education ought to include all necessary subjects in due proportion; yet most speakers take up one subject and champion it against all others. Thus Sir E. Ray Lankester wishes to put 'a well-considered course of science' in place of 'the cumbrous efforts to teach the Greek language to schoolboys.' His speech was full of epithets like these, that beg the question at issue. Perhaps it is not yet too late to plead for harmony instead of quarrelling, and a well-considered course of education instead of this or that subject.

It is worth while to call attention to the paper read on January 10th by the Head-master of Clifton before the Incorporated Association of Headmasters. Mr. King, as reported in the *Times*, sketched the lines of modern education in France—lines which we show symptoms of wishing to follow—and pointed out that they are severely criticised by French opinion. 'In France lately there had been an interesting controversy with regard to the new programme fixed for the seconding schools in 1902, the results of which were meeting with a good deal of criticism, and had caused widespread dissatisfaction. They had always understood the pride of French education to be that it produced clear thinking and clear expression, but they were now told that, as a

result of the new programme, general culture was declining and with it the power to think, compose, and write.

'The idea was to teach French alone, to do away, they were told, with dead languages and the history of a profitless past. According to critics, the result had been that Latin had lost its educative force, that there was no Greek to second Latin, while French had become a special subject like the rest and was perishing.

'The modern student, it was said, could not write French and did not think. Taste, composition, and style were going. Minute specialisation took the place of study of the great authors, and *savants* took the place of humanists.'

'Doing away with dead languages and the history of a profitless past,' does not, apparently, bring the millennium after all! Well—England is still at the parting of the ways.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### ARISTOTLE'S POETICS.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

MR. HAMILTON-FYFE, in the *Classical Review* for this month, in his comments upon Aristotle's *Poetics*, ch. xxi. § 5, seems to take it for granted that *ἰαμβοποιεῖν* means 'to write hexameters.' May it not equally well be translated 'to write iambs.' The two confessedly corrupt, and unsuccessfully emended lines, if read accentually, quantity being disregarded, make comic *senarii* of a sort, thus:

1. Ἐπιχά οντα	ρην εἰ	δον Μαρά	θῶνᾶ	δε βαδίξ
2. οὐκ ἄν βορον	γερὰ	μενός τόν	ἐκεί-	νὸν ἑλλέ

all accented syllables being counted as long, and unaccented as short. The only foot that is faulty is No. 4 in line 1—but I think that one MS. reads *Μαραθωνάδε*. May not *ἐκτείνειν ἐφ' ὅσον βούλεται* mean 'to make an accented syllable as long as you please,' an unaccented syllable being shortened? It is a strange fact that a modern Greek would consider these lines iambs, and no amount of torturing them by emendations and addition of letters could twist them into accentual hexameters for him.

I should say *ἰαμβοποιήσας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ λέξει* might mean 'taking the speech (in which the passages occur) just as it stands, and turning it into iambs.'

ALFRED D. COPE.

The Rectory, Little Bromley, Manningtree.  
December 31, 1910.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

Re ARISTOTLE, *POET.* 1458<sup>b</sup> 7.

MR. FYFE replies:

I did not translate *ἰαμβοποιεῖν* as 'to write hexameters.' I took it to mean simply to 'parody,' like *ἰαμβίζειν* with the sense of 'iambic metre' inert in the word. In the whole of this passage Aristotle is speaking of the proper use of poetic licence and drawing his examples now from Epic, now from Tragedy. At this particular point his attention is fixed on Epic, as is shown by the words *ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπῶν* in l. 16. It therefore seems probable that Eucleides was making fun of the incontinent use of poetic licence in *Epic* and that his lines are therefore mock *hexameters*.

They can be forced into almost any metre. It seems more natural to suppose them to be meant for hexameters, both for the reason given already and because this particular licence of lengthening short syllables by 'ictus' is characteristic of Epic. The pet licence of Tragedy is noted below in the allusion to Ariphraides. I doubt very much if *ἰαμβοποιήσας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ λέξει* could bear the meaning he suggests, and, anyway, why should Eucleides want to turn it into comic *senarii*? To suit the context he must have turned it into either tragic iambs or hexameters: the latter, I still think.

Merton College, Oxford.  
January 8, 1911.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

THE emendation in Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus* (*Classical Review*, 24, 240) has not been neglected, but approved by the best editor of the *Vitae, Sinenis*, I Lips., 1884, p. ix and (text) 83, 27 (Bibl. Teubner).

H. DIELS, LL.D.  
Berlin, December 18, 1910.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.*

*\* \* Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Altchristliche Texte.* By C. Schmidt and W. Schubart (Berliner Klassikertexte). 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 140. Mit 2 Lichtdrucktafeln. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. M. 10.
- Barbagallo* (Corrado) *Lo Stato e l'istruzione pubblica nell'imperio Romano.* 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 432. Catania: Fr. Battiato, 1911. L. 6.
- Caesarstudien* nebst einer Analyse der Strabonischen Beschreibung von Gallien und Britannien. Von Alfred Klotz. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Pp. 267. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910. M. 6.
- Cicero.* Selected Letters. Edited by E. Riess. 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. lix+396. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1910. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Costa* (G.) *I Fasti Consolari Romani.* Vol. I., in two parts. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+547 and vi+150. Milan: Libreria Editrice Milanese, 1910.
- Curlé* (J.) *A Roman Frontier Post and its People: The Fort of Newstead.* 12" x 9". Pp. xix+432, with many plans, full-page plates, and illustrations in text. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1910. Cloth.
- Cyzicus:* Its History and Antiquities. By F. W. Hasluck. (Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series.) 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+326. Cambridge: University Press, 1910. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur ῥήτοι ἐπιστολικοὶ et ἐπιστολμαῖοι χαρακτήρες.* By V. Weichert. 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. lxxiii+36. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910. M. 2.60.
- Die Grabschrift des Aberkios, ihre Überlieferung ihr Text,* von W. Lüdtke und Th. Nissen. Mit einer Tafel. Teubner's Text. Leipzig, 1910. M. 1.
- Dioniso.* Saggio sulla Religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane. By Carlo Pascal. 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi+260. Catania: Fr. Battiato, 1911. L. 5.
- Donatiana.* By Paulus Tscherniaef. 9" x 6". Pp. 211-222. Varsovie University, 1910.
- Fairbanks* (A.) *A Handbook of Greek Religion.* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 384. New York: The American Book Co., 1910. Cloth.
- Fiske* (G. C.) *Lucilius and Persius.* (Extracted from Trans. Amer. Philol. Ass. xl. 1910.) 9" x 6". Pp. 121-150.
- Fitzhugh* (T.) *Evolution of the Saturnian Verse.* (Extracted from Proc. Amer. Philol. Ass. xl. 1910.) 9" x 6". Pp. xxix-xxxviii.
- Foster* (B. D.) *On certain Euphonic Embellishments in the Verse of Propertius* (from Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc., 1910, vol. xl.). 9" x 6". Pp. 31-62.
- Fries* (C.) *Studien zur Odyssee.* 1. Das Zagmukfest auf Scheria. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+340. Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1910. M. 9.
- Furtwängler* (A.) *Beschreibung der Glyptothek König Ludwig's I. zu München.* Zweite Auflage, besorgt von P. Wolters. 8" x 5". Pp. vii+418. München: Buchholz, 1910. M. 3.50.
- Grueber* (H. A.) *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum, Catalogue with Introduction.* Two vols., and 123 plates in separate volume. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. cxxvi+594 and 592. 1910.
- Haldane* (R. B.) *Universities and National Life: Three Addresses to Students.* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 110. London: John Murray, 1910. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of Harvard University. Vol. XXI. 9" x 6". Pp. 171. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910. Paper boards, 6s. 6d. net.
- Heidrich* (G.) *Arrian's Anabasis.* Zwei Teile. I. Einleitung und Text. II. Erklärende Anmerkungen und Wörterbuch. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. 114 and 134. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1911. Cloth, M. 1.75 each.
- Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution.* Tome Neuvième. Le Règne de Louis XVI. (1774-1789), par H. Carré, P. Sagnac, et E. Lavisse. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 446. Paris: Hachette, 1910. 10 f.
- Homer* (Odyssey) *Faesi.* Vol. II., Books VII.-XII. Ninth Edition, by J. Sitzler. 8" x 5". Pp. 268. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. M. 2.60.
- Lawson* (J. G.) *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion: A Study in Survivals.* 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+620. Cambridge: University Press, 1910. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Livy.* The Seven Kings of Rome. By G. H. Hall. Macmillan's Elementary Classics. 6" x 4". Pp. x+146. London: Macmillan and Co., 1910. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Maclure* (F. C.) *Greek Accents.* 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 16. Gill and Sons, 1910.
- Maronzeau* (J.) *La Phrase à Verbe Être en Latin.* 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii+334. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1910.
- Mommsen* (T.) *Gesammelte Schriften.* Vol. VI. (Vol. III. of Historical Writings). 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii+695. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. M. 17.
- Mosso* (A.) *The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization.* Translated by Marian C. Harrison. With 203 illustrations. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxiii+424. London: Fisher Unwin, 1910. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Myres* (J. L.) *Greek Lands and the Greek People.* Inaugural Lecture. 9" x 6". Pp. 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. 1s. 6d. net.

- Niedermann* (M.) *Outlines of Latin Phonetics*. Edited by H. A. Strong and H. Stewart.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 108. London: Geo. Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1910. 2s. 6d. net.
- Novum Testamentum Graece*. The Revisers' Text, with a new Apparatus Criticus. By Alexander Sonter.  $8'' \times 5''$ . Pp. xxiv+480. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. Cloth, 3s. net.
- Octavius* (M. Minucii Felices) *On Introduzione e Commento di Luigi Valmaggì*. Biblioteca Scolastica di Scrittori Latini, con Note.  $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. xxxii+98. Turin: Paravia and Co., 1910. L. 1.60.
- Ovid* (Metamorphoses) *Stories Chosen and Edited by D. A. Slater*.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 140, with 6 full-page illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Pascal*. See *Dioniso*.
- Persius, Juvenal, and Sulpicia* (Satires) Otto Jahn. Fourth Edition, by F. Leo.  $8'' \times 5''$ . Pp. xxiv+304. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. M. 3.40.
- Plato* (Protagoras) By A. Th. Christ.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. 107. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1910. Cloth, M. 1.
- Plummann* (G.) *Ptolemais in Oberägypten*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hellenismus in Ägypten. Historische Abhandlungen. Heft xviii.  $9'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. xii+136. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1910. M. 4.50.
- Plutarch* (Auswahl) By H. Schickinger. II. Teil. Erklärende Anmerkungen. Mit einem Wörterverzeichnis.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. 192. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1911. Cloth, M. 1.50.
- *Leben des Lykurgos*. Von W. Sieglin.  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 132. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. M. 4.40.
- *Cimon and Pericles, with the Funeral Oration of Pericles*. Newly translated, with Introduction and Notes, by B. Perrin.  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. xiv+288. New York: Scribner, 1910. Cloth, \$2 net.
- Polaschek* (Anton) *Schulwörterbuch zu Caesar's Bellum Gallicum*. Fünfte Auflage. Mit 72 Abbildungen und Karten.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 176. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1911. Cloth, M. 2.
- Prinz* (K.) *Lateinisches Lesebuch, für Gymnasien und andere Lehranstalten mit Lateinunterricht*. Zwei Teile. I. Bruchstücke aus Leichten Prosaikern. II. Erklärende Anmerkungen und Wörterbuch. Mit Karten und Plänen. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1910. Cloth, M. 1.50 each.
- Quellenkunde zur Weltgeschichte*. Ein Handbuch. Unter Mitwirkung von Dr. Adolf Hofmeister und Dr. Rudolf Stübe bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Dr. Paul Herse.  $10'' \times 7''$ . Pp. xii+400. Leipzig: Theodor Welcher, 1910. M. 4.80.
- Reinhardt* (C.) *De Graecorum Theologia, capita duo*.  $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 122. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. M. 4.
- Rodd* (Sir R.) *The Englishman in Greece*. A Collection of Verse of many English Poets, with an Introduction.  $7'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 328. Oxford: University Press, 1910. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Rostowzew* (M.) *Studien zur Geschichte des Römischen Kolonates*. Erstes Beiheft zum Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete. Herausgegeben von Ulrich Wilcken.  $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910. M. 14.
- Samter* (Ernst) *Geburt, Hochzeit und Tod*. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Volkskunde. Mit 7 Abbildungen im Text und auf 3 Tafeln.  $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 222. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910. M. 6.
- Sandys* (J. E.) *A Companion to Latin Studies*.  $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. vii+891. Cambridge: University Press, 1910. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Schrirmer* (K.) *Bilder aus dem Altrömischen Leben*. Mit 30 in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. viii+148. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. Cloth, M. 2.50.
- Schuppe* (W.) *Grundriss der Erkenntnistheorie und Logik*.  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. x+189. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. M. 3.
- Shorey* (D. A.) *A Symposium on the Value of Humanistic particularly Classical Studies: The Classics and the New Education*. III. The Case for the Classics (from *School Review*, Nov., 1910).  $9'' \times 6\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. 585-617. Chicago University Press.
- *φύσις Μελέτη Ἐπιστήμη*. (From Trans. Amer. Philol. Ass., 1910, vol. xl.)  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 185-201.
- Slater* (D. A.) *Aeneas and other Verses and Versions*.  $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 61. Oxford: University Press, 1910. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen und Römer* von U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf und B. Niese. Die Kultur die Gegenwart, II. iv. 1.  $10'' \times 7''$ . Pp. vi+280. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910. M. 8.
- Tacitus* *Histories* (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis). By C. D. Fisher.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Terence* (the Comedies of) Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by S. G. Ashmore, L.H.D. Second Edition.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 68+290+340. Oxford: University Press, American Branch, 1910. Cloth.
- Treu* (G.) *Das Erbe der Alten*. Heft I. Hellenische Stimmungen in der Bildhauerei von Einst und Jetzt.  $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 52. Leipzig: Weicher, 1910. M. 1.80.
- Virgil*. *Aeneid, Book XII*. By L. D. Wainwright. (Bell's Illustrated Classics.)  $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4''$ . Pp. viii+116+xi. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1910. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Vollmer* (F.) *Poetae Latini Minores*. Vol. II. Fasc. 1. *Ovidi Haleuticon, Libri I. Fragmentum, Gratti Cynegeticon, Libri I. Fragmentum*. Teubner's Text.  $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. 53. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. M. .60.